DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 049 392 VT 012 989

AUTHOR	Harris, E. Edward
TITLE	Employer Preferences and Teacher-Coordinator Practices in Distributive Education.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	71
NOTE	64p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Cooperative Education, Cooperative Programs, *Distributive Education, *Educational Practice, *Employer Attitudes, *Instructor Coordinators, Questionnaires, Vocational Education

ABSTRACT

Employer preferences and teacher-coordinator practices were studied and the results compiled to serve as an aid in implementing programs in cooperative vocational education, particularly on the secondary school level. A pilot study, involving 100 employers and 50 teacher-coordinators, was conducted using the questionnaire technique, then was followed by a comprehensive study of 496 teacher-coordinators and 544 employers. The findings indicated that (1) employers in general merchandise and the automotive fields felt training sessions were more important than did employers in other fields, (2) employers who had trained four or more students in the past 2 years felt an advisory committee was very important, and (3) teacher-coordinators from inner city high schools felt a training agreement was less important than did schools from other locations. Specific recommendations were that teacher-coordinators should place increased emphasis on training plans, advisory committees, and training sponsors, and that placement activities must include a review of students in relation to particular expectations. (GEB)

ED049392

Employer Preferences and Teacher-Coordinator Practices in

Distributive Education

Region V—U.S. Office of Education

E. Edward Harris, Ph.D.
Northern Illinois University
De Kalb, Illinois

VTU12989

1

IT HAS BEEN SAID that cooperative education represents a sleeping giant in vocational education. The resources and environment for its further development are now self-evident. Congress has made cooperative education a priority in vocational education; a new sense of social responsibility exists in the business and industrial community; youth wants "relevant" education. In this climate, vocational educators have a unique opportunity to extend the range of vocational education through cooperative vocational education.

As cooperative programs spread and become accepted in more and more communities, there arises a concomitant need for more research to support an educational method that utilizes the work environment to produce desired vocational outcomes. A well-documented and readable research report can assist teacher-coordinators in identifying problems and finding workable methods of strengthening their own programs.

Such a report was recently prepared by Region V of the U.S. Office of Education and is entitled *Employer Preferences and Teacher-Coordinator Practices in Distributive Education.* Although this report was prepared by and for distributive educators in Region V, the findings and recommendations have implications extending well beyond the geographical borders of Region V and even beyond the confines of this one vocational field.

This report offers 21 significant recommendations designed to improve the business and education dialogue and thereby improve the organization and operation of all cooperative education programs.

The Gregg Division, McGraw-Hill Book Company, is pleased to publish this report as a professional service to vocational education.

ED049392

Employer Preferences and Teacher-Coordinator Practices in

Distributive Education

Region V—U.S. Office of Education

E. Edward Harris, Ph.D.
Northern Illinois University
De Kalb, Illinois

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CONTENTS

Foreword v
Preface and Acknowledgements vi

I PROBLEM AND PROCEDURE

Statement of the Problem 1
Definition of Terms 2
Procedure 2

II FINDINGS

Importance of Selected Operational Activities in Distributive Education Programs 3
Analysis of Teacher-Coordinator Activities 5
Identification of Areas of Concern to Employers and Educators 8
Competencies of Distributive Education Student/Trainees 11
Competencies of Distributive Education Graduates 15
Reasons for Business Participation in Distributive Education 19
Techniques for Securing Training Stations 23
Student Placement Procedures 23
Frequency of Coordination Visits 23
Relationship Between Number of Employees in Firm and Training Effectiveness 23
Preferences and Practices in Employment of Students 23
Personal Characteristics of Distributive Education Student/Trainees 34
Personal Characteristics of Distributive Education Graduates 34

III RECOMMENDATIONS 35

APPENDICES

A Participation in Region V Distributive Education Research by Employers and Teacher-Coordinators 38

B Employer Classification Data 39

C Teacher-Coordinator Classification Data 41

D Combined Form I and II Teacher-Coordinator Questionnaire 43

E Combined Form I and II Employer Questionnaire 49

F Teacher-Coordinator Letter of Transmittal 55

G Employer Letter of Transmittal 56

H Follow-Up Letter 57

FOREWORD

With the emphasis that has been given to cooperative vocational education through recent vocational education legislation, it was a decision of the Region V Program Planning Committee for Distributive Education that a contribution could be made to vocational education through an identification of policies and practices that have developed over the thirty years in which distributive education has utilized a cooperative plan.

This report is the result of a study to determine employer preferences and teacher-coordinator practices in distributive education within five states of Region V, U.S. Office of Education. It is hoped that the findings and recommendations will prove helpful in the implementation of programs in cooperative vocational education.

The Region V Office of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education wishes to acknowledge its appreciation to the following for their contributions to this study:

The Region V Program Planning Committee for Distributive Education. This study was initiated under the chairmanship of Mr. James Biddle, state supervisor of distributive education, Indiana, and completed under the chairmanship of Mr. Vernon Swenson, state supervisor of business and distributive education, Wisconsin.

Dr. E. Edward Harris, professor and teacher educator of distributive education, Northern Illinois University, DeKalb Illinois, for his professional contributions in developing and directing this study from its inception to its completion, including the final writing of this publication. Also, to those staff members and graduate assistants at Northern Illinois University for their contributions to the study.

The employers of distributive education students and the teacher-coordinators who gave of their time to sincerely respond to the survey questionnaires.

The Sears-Roebuck Foundation for its encouragement and its funding of the costs of materials, postage, clerical, and computer time.

The Gregg Division, McGraw-Hill Book Company, for its interest in serving distributive education and its publishing of this study as a public service to vocational education.

It was a pleasure for the Region V Office to cooperate with the Region V Program Planning Committee for Distributive Education in planning and completing this study of employer preferences and teacher-coordinator practices in distributive education.

William L. Lewis, Director
Adult, Vocational and Technical Education
Region V
U.S. Office of Education

PREFACE AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report is the culmination of almost two years' study and research to determine employer preferences and teacher-coordinator practices as they relate to the organization and operation of cooperative-plan programs in distributive education at the secondary school level. Special emphasis was given to those aspects of the program which could best serve as a basis for improved dialogue between employer and teacher-coordinator. The services of educators and employers were solicited in designing the research in order that the findings of the study would be of maximum use in the field.

Written specifically for use by personnel at the grass roots level, this report includes tables that are printed in a type size suitable for preparing overhead projector transparencies for use in conducting pre-service training sessions for administrators and teachers of cooperative vocational education. The report is divided into four sections: Chapter I—Problem and Procedure; Chapter II—Findings; Chapter III—Recommendations; and Appendices.

The study was conducted through the leadership of Daryl E. Nichols, program officer in vocational and technical education, U.S. Office of Education, Region V, Chicago, Illinois. The Region V Program Planning Committee for Distributive Education, consisting of thirty selected leaders from education and business in the five-state U.S. Office of Education area, endorsed the need for the study and provided data essential for conducting the research.

The following members of the Research Coordinating Committee deserve special recognition: Mr. Wayne Harrison (Wisconsin), Mr. Richard Shupe (Michigan), Dr. Herbert Ross (Indiana), and Mr. Albert Kurtz (Ohio). Recognition is also given to Miss Mary V. Marks and Mr. Edwin L. Nelson, U.S. Office of Education, and Mr. Warren G. Meyer, University of Minnesota, for their assistance in the design of the research instruments.

The untiring efforts of Miss Sheila Whitney, Miss Dorothy Turek, Mr. Robert Sherman, and Mr. Robert Witherspoon, graduate assistants at Northern Illinois University, are saluted. The technical and professional assistance provided by Dr. Barbara Sethney, Mrs. Evelyn Siminson, Mr. William Westley, and Mr. Jack Hall are sincerely acknowledged. A special note of thanks is extended to the employers and teacher-coordinators who took time to carefully complete the survey forms.

E. Edward Harris
Project Director and
Chairman, Research Coordinating Committee
Region V Program Planning Committee

DeKalb, Illinois
February 1, 1971

CHAPTER I
PROBLEM AND PROCEDURE

Increasingly, programs in education are being developed, implemented, or enriched through the application of the concepts essential to the cooperative plan. Viable working relationships between personnel in the employing and educational communities play a major role in the success of these cooperative ventures. The National Advisory Council on Vocational Education highlighted the need for extending one of these cooperative arrangements when it stated: "The part-time cooperative plan is undoubtedly the best program we have in vocational education. It consistently yields high placement records, high employment stability, and high job satisfaction."

Distributive education is one of the best known secondary school instructional programs using the cooperative plan. It is hoped that the experiences of educators and employers involved in distributive education programs will be useful to individuals responsible for the development and administration of programs in cooperative vocational education.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The major purpose of this study was to determine employer preferences and teacher-coordinator practices as they relate to the organization and operation of cooperative-plan distributive education programs at the secondary school level. Specifically, answers to the following interrelated questions were sought:

1. How important are selected operational and teacher-coordinator activities to the success of cooperative-plan distributive education programs?
2. What proportion of coordination time is devoted to selected activities?
3. What are the major problems faced by employers and teacher-coordinators that limit the effectiveness of the instructional plan?
4. What level of achievement of selected competencies is needed by high school distributive education students and by graduates as full-time employees?
5. What is the actual level of achievement of selected competencies possessed by students for employment as distributive education student/trainees and by graduates of the program?
6. What is the relationship between the level of achievement in selected competencies preferred by employers and the level actually possessed by distributive education students and graduates?
7. What selected personal characteristics are needed by student/trainees and by graduates?
8. What selected personal characteristics are possessed by students and by graduates of the distributive education program?
9. What is the relationship between the extent of development of selected personal characteristics preferred by employers and those characteristics actually possessed by distributive education students and graduates?
10. What are the reasons for business participation in the cooperative distributive education program?
11. Which techniques used by teacher-coordinators for securing training stations do employers find most effective in gaining the participation of their firms? What is the relationship between those techniques and the ones actually used by teacher-coordinators?
12. What procedures do employers want coordinators to follow in placing students and scheduling coordination visits? How do these preferences compare with the practices of teacher-coordinators?
13. What is the relationship between the preferences of various groups of employers and the following business classification data: nature, type, and location of business, number of employees, and number of distributive education students trained during the past two years?
14. What is the relationship between the practices of various groups of teacher-coordinators and the following classification data: location and type of school, years of experience as coordinator, utilization of advisory committee, and utilization of training plan?

DEFINITION OF TERMS

GENERAL MERCHANDISE: Firms such as department stores, junior department stores, variety stores, general merchandise stores, discount stores and catalog houses.

OTHER (DISTRIBUTIVE BUSINESS): Establishments engaged in selling products or providing services to individuals and business establishments, which are not classifiable as either retail or wholesale in nature and function.

RETAIL TRADE, OTHER: Establishments engaged in selling merchandise purchased for resale to customers for personal, household, business, or farm use, which are not listed in one of the 19 other U.S. Office of Education Instructional Program Area categories.

TRAINING AGREEMENT: A form prepared by the teacher-coordinator that indicates the period of training, hours of work, salary, and other pertinent facts and information necessary to assure basic understanding of the student/trainee's position in the cooperative education program. The form may be signed by coordinator, employer, student, and parents.

TRAINING PLAN: A written program of experiences delineating what is to be learned by a specific student/trainee and whether the learning is to take place in the classroom (group or individual instruction) or on the job or both. The plan is derived from a realistic analysis of the tasks, duties, responsibilities, and occupational objectives of the student/trainee.

TRAINING SPONSOR: The individual to whom the student/trainee looks for instruction and training on the job. The on-the-job training sponsor may be the owner or manager or a responsible individual appointed by the management.

PROCEDURE

William McCurdy, president of The Sears-Roebuck Foundation, in presenting the keynote address for the Region V Distributive Education Conference in Ft. Wayne, Indiana, on April 29, 1969, called for improved business and education dialogue. Various strategies for gathering data essential for developing improved dialogue were given serious consideration at a series of meetings held in the spring of 1969.

During the summer and fall of 1969, the objectives of the study were established and numerous data-collecting instruments were examined. The mailed questionnaire survey technique was endorsed by the Region V Distributive Education Planning Committee as the most feasible exploratory research technique for collecting the initial data. Additional studies were also to be conducted at a later date by doctoral students on the perceptions of various publics involved in distributive education. Information essential for conducting the pilot study was provided by the supervisors of distributive education in the states of Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, and Wisconsin so that the study could be conducted beginning February 1, 1970.

The 100 employers and 50 teacher-coordinators in the pilot study were selected on the basis of data available from the U.S. Office of Education, Region V, to help insure that a sample which was representative of distributive education in the five-state area was selected. The responses to the questions in open-ended and close-ended survey forms provided information for improving the survey instruments and for determining the number of responses needed to each question. An 80 percent teacher-coordinator response and a 58 percent employer response was obtained on the pilot study. One follow-up letter was mailed to increase responses both during the field testing and the final research study (see Appendix H).

Two slightly different forms were designed for collecting data from employers and teacher-coordinators (see Appendices D and E for combined forms).

Most of the questions appeared on both Forms I and II, while approximately five of the questions were printed on just Form I or Form II. This procedure was followed so that the data required could be provided by the respondents in less than 15 minutes.

During the early part of May, forms were mailed to every teacher-coordinator in the five-state Region V area who had supplied a list containing the name of each distributive education student in his program, the name and address of the students' employers, and the name of a contact person in the employing firms. Information was provided on approximately 9,500 employers by the teacher-coordinators. Employers were selected for participation in this study by a systematic random sample.

One out of every nine firms who employ distributive education students in Region V was asked to participate in the study. However, at least one employer working with each distributive education program was selected.

Appendices A, B, and C contain a complete analysis and report of the 496 (72 percent) responses obtained from teacher-coordinators and the 544 (50.1 percent) replies from employers by selected classification data. The employer and teacher-coordinator classifications were also used in analyzing responses to selected key questions. Two major programs were to assist in processing the data with the 360-50 computer: Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS)[1] and Telestorage and Retrevial System (TSAR).[2]

---

[1]Norman Nie, Dale Bent, and C. Hadlai Hull, *Statistical Package for Social Sciences*, National Opinion Research Center, University of Chicago, McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1970.

[2]*Telestorage and Retrieval System*, Duke University Computations Center, Durham, North Carolina, 1969.

CHAPTER II
FINDINGS

IMPORTANCE OF SELECTED OPERATIONAL ACTIVITIES IN DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Both employers and coordinators indicated the importance of selected operational activities of the cooperative plan by using the following scale: 1 = very important; 2 = desirable; and 3 = unimportant. All nine of the selected activities were rated as being either very important or desirable (less than 2.5) by both employers and teacher-coordinators. However, the mean values show that teacher-coordinators rated each of the selected activities as being more important to the operation of the distributive education program than did employers.

Data in the rank order columns of Table 1 show that statistically significant differences do exist in the relative importance of the operational activities as rated by employers and coordinators. Employers ranked the following program activities higher in importance than did coordinators: a plan of training for each student developed by coordinator and training sponsor; the assignment of a specific individual to serve as an on-the-job training sponsor for each student; and an advisory committee to advise school officials on program evaluation.

Coordinators judged the following program activities of greater importance than did employers: a written agreement establishing the responsibilities of student, school, and employer; and participation by business representatives in the classroom-instruction phase of the program.

Analysis of Data by Employer Groups

Statistically significant differences existed in how important each of the employer groups believed the selected operational activities were to the success of the distributive education program.[1]

1. Employers representing businesses classified as general merchandise indicated that the assignment of a specific individual to serve as training sponsor for each distributive education student was *more important* to the operation of the distributive education program than did employers in other types of businesses.
2. Employers in businesses classified as (a) retail trade; other and (b) other (distributive business) indicated that the assignment of a specific person to serve as a training sponsor for each distributive education student was *less important* to the operation of the distributive education program than did employers in other types of businesses.
3. Employers operating businesses classified as (a) general merchandise and (b) automotive and (c) those representing firms that had trained four or more distributive education students during the past two years indicated that training sessions to prepare training sponsors were *more important* to the operation of the distributive education program than did other employers.
4. Employers operating businesses classified as (a) retail and (b) those representing firms that had trained four or more distributive education students during the past two years indicated that business representatives' participation in the classroom-instruction phase of the distributive education program is *more important* to the operation of the distributive education program than did other employer groups.
5. Employers operating businesses classified as (a) general merchandise, (b) apparel and accessories, and (c) those representing firms that had trained four or more distributive education students over the past two years indicated that business representatives' participation in DECA youth group activities is *more important* to the operation of the distributive education program than did other employers.
6. Employers representing firms that had trained four or more distributive education students over the past two years indicated that an advisory committee is *more important* to the operation of the distributive education program than did employers who had not participated as extensively in the program.
7. Employers operating businesses classified as being retail or wholesale indicated that classroom instruction related to the on-the-job

[1]See Appendix B for listing of data of participating employers by nature and type of business and by number of distributive education students trained during the past two years.

TABLE 1

EMPLOYERS ASKED: What is the importance of each of the following activities to the operation of the distributive education program?

COORDINATORS ASKED: What is the importance of each of the following activities to the operation of the distributive education program?

EMPLOYERS		TYPE OF ACTIVITY	COORDINATORS	
MEAN*	RANK ORDER†		RANK ORDER†	MEAN*
N=474			N=490	
1.643	1	Classroom instruction having a relationship to the learning experience of a student in his training station	1	1.160
1.795	2	Training materials for the student to study in school that are related to his training station experiences	2	1.248
2.010	3.5	A plan of training for each student developed by coordinator and training sponsor	5	1.544
2.033	3.5	Assignment of a specific individual to serve as an on-the-job training sponsor for each distributive education student	5	1.571
2.106	5	Advisory committee (made up of members representative of the employing community) to advise school officials on program operation	7.5	1.674
2.180	6	A written agreement establishing the responsibilities of student, school, and employer	3	1.424
2.300	8	Training sessions held to prepare training sponsors for their role in training of distributive education students	9	2.081
2.317	8	Participation in DECA youth group activities, i.e. serving as judges for competitive events, on field trips, at employee-employer banquets	7.5	1.674
2.341	8	Participation by business representatives in the classroom-instruction phase of the program, i.e. speaker, etc.	5	1.577

*Code for Mean Values: 1=Very important; 2=Desirable; 3=Unimportant

†Two-Tailed T Tests Used to Determine Rank Order

learning experiences is *more important* to the operation of the distributive education program than did employers in service businesses.

8. Employers representing firms that had trained four or more distributive education students over the past two years indicated that classroom instruction related to the on-the-job learning experiences is *more important* to the operation of the distributive education program than did employers who had not participated as extensively in the program.
9. Employers representing businesses classified as being general merchandise indicated that materials given to the distributive education student which are related to his on-the-job learning experiences are *more important* to the operation of the distributive education program then did employers in other types of businesses.
10. Employers representing firms that had trained four or more students over the past two years indicated that training agreements were *more important* to the operation of the distributive education program than did employers who had trained fewer students.
11. Employers representing firms classified as (a) general merchandise and (b) businesses that had trained four or more distributive education students over the past two years indicated that a plan of training for each student developed by coordinator and training sponsor is *more important* to the operation of the distributive education program than did the other employer groups studied.

Analysis of Data by Teacher-Coordinator Groups

The practices of the 490 teacher-coordinators were analyzed in relation to selected distributive education programs, school, and community characteristics. Statistically significant differences existed in how important each of the coordinator groups studied believed the selected operational activities were to the success of the distributive education program.[2]

1. Teacher-coordinators with distributive education advisory committees indicated that a training plan for each student is *more important* to the operation of their distributive education program than did coordinators without advisory committees.
2. Teacher-coordinators who work with employers and/or training sponsors to develop on-the-job training plans indicated that the assignment of a training sponsor is *more important* to the operation of the distributive education program than did coordinators who did not develop plans with personnel in business.
3. Teacher-coordinators with advisory committees indicated that the participation of businessmen in the classroom is *more important* to the operation of the distributive education program than did coordinators without advisory committees.
4. Teacher-coordinators with advisory committees indicated that an advisory committee is *more important* to the operation of the distributive education program than coordinators without advisory committees.
5. Teacher-coordinators with less than three years' experience indicated that training agreements were *more important* to the operation of the distributive education program than did coordinators with three or more years' experience.
6. Teacher-coordinators from inner-city high schools indicated that a training agreement was *less important* to the operation of the distributive education program than did coordinators from schools in other types of locations.

ANALYSIS OF TEACHER-COORDINATOR ACTIVITIES

The teacher-coordinators surveyed were asked to review their activities and estimate the proportion of total coordination time devoted to selected activities. Data in Table 2 show the percentage of the 492 teacher-coordinators who indicated that they had devoted time to the selected coordination activities.

The highest percentage of the coordinators devoted less than 10 percent of their time to each of the following activities: working with training sponsor and/or employer in implementing an on-the-job training plan; working with training sponsor and/or employer to solve student's on-the-job problems; establishing and maintaining good working relationships with personnel of the firm; and working on public relations activities in the community. The typical coordinator surveyed devotes 10 to 35 percent of his time to the following: explaining the training program and the role of the employer and/or training sponsor; discussing with the employer and/or training sponsor work performed by the student in school that is related to the student's present and future employment; working with the training sponsor or other personnel to solve the student's personal problems; and working on in-school activities.

Employers were asked how important they felt selected teacher-coordinator activities were to the success of the distributive education program in their firm. Using the scale 1 = very important, 2 = desirable, and 3 = unimportant, the 474 employers rated the teacher-coordinator activities.

Employers rank order data in Table 3 show that employers consider the most important coordinator activity to be establishing and maintaining good working relationships with officials of the firm. The data in Table 3 also show a comparison between the

[2]See Appendix C for listing of classification data by teacher-coordinator experience and location of schools in which distributive education programs are located.

TABLE 2

COORDINATORS ASKED: What is the approximate percentage of total coordination time devoted to selected activities?

COORDINATOR ACTIVITY	NONE	LESS THAN 10%	10-35%	MORE THAN 35%	DON'T KNOW	NO RESPONSE
N=492	PERCENTAGE OF COORDINATORS INDICATING					
Explaining the training program and the role of the employer and/or training sponsor	.4	22.2	52.8	22.6	1.2	.8
Working with training sponsor and/or employer in implementing an on-the-job training plan	.8	50.4	41.6	4.8	1.0	1.4
Discussing with employer and/or training sponsor work performed by the student in school related to the student's present and future employment	.4	39.5	43.9	13.4	1.4	1.4
Working with training sponsor and/or employer to solve student's on-the-job problems	3.2	46.7	43.1	3.8	2.0	1.2
Working with training sponsor or other personnel of firm to solve student's personal problems	.4	34.5	48.5	14.6	.6	1.4
Establishing and maintaining good working relationships with personnel of the firm	3.0	64.0	25.6	4.0	2.0	1.4
Working on in-school activities, i.e. preparing reports, guidance activities, etc.	.4	32.1	48.4	18.3	.4	1.4
Working on public relations activities in the community	2.6	50.5	36.4	7.5	1.4	1.6

TABLE 3

EMPLOYERS ASKED: How important are the selected teacher-coordinator activities in the operation of the distributive education program?

COORDINATORS ASKED: What proportion of your total coordination time is devoted to the selected activities?

EMPLOYERS RANK ORDER* N=474	COORDINATION ACTIVITIES	COORDINATORS RANK ORDER* N=492
1	To establish and maintain good working relationships with officials of the firm	6
2	To work with your training sponsors to solve students' on-the-job problems	4.5
3.5	To explain the training program and the role of the employer and /or training sponsor	1
3.5	To discuss work performed by the student in the distributive education class which is related to the student's present and future employment	2.5
5	To work with necessary personnel to solve students' personal problems	2.5
6	To work with training sponsor or employer to implement on-the-job training plan	4.5

*Two-Tailed T Tests Used to Determine Rank Order

importance assigned by employers and a rank order for coordinators, which was prepared for study purposes only. It is important to keep in mind that even though the above-mentioned coordinator activity was indicated by employers as being most important, coordinators may be able to successfully accomplish this activity by devoting a smaller amount of coordination time than is required on either of the coordination activities related to solving student job problems.

Employer preferences and teacher-coordinator data in Table 3 show that a number of other differences do exist. For example, employers indicate that solving students' on-the-job problems is relatively more important than the time priorities given to the activity by teacher-coordinators.

Analysis of Data by Employer Groups

Some of the teacher-coordinator activities were considered to be more important by various employer groups. The analysis of data yielded the following statistically significant findings.[3]

1. Employers representing firms that were classified as (a) general merchandise and (b) those which had trained four or more distributive education students over the past two years indicated that establishing and maintaining good working relationships with business firm personnel is a *more important* teacher-coordinator activity than did other employer groups.
2. Employers from general merchandise firms indicated that explaining the training program and role of employer and/or training sponsor is a *more important* teacher-coordinator activity than did other types of employers.
3. Employers representing firms that had trained four or more distributive education students indicated that working with the training sponsor in developing and implementing on-the-job training plans is a *more important* teacher-coordinator activity than did employers who had trained fewer distributive education students.
4. Employers representing firms that were classified as (a) general merchandise and (b) those which had trained four or more distributive education students indicated that working with the training sponsor or employer to solve students' on-the-job and personal problems is a *more important* teacher-coordinator activity than did other employer groups.
5. Food service industry employers indicated that discussing work performed by the student in the distributive education class which is related to the student's present and future employment is a *less important* teacher-coordinator activity than did employers from other types of businesses.
6. Employers representing firms classified as retail trade; other indicated that establishing a good working relationship with business firm personnel is a *less important* teacher-coordinator activity than did employers from other types of businesses.

Analysis of Data by Teacher-Coordinator Groups

The statistical analysis of the data showed that a significantly larger proportion of teacher-coordinators with common personal, program, school, and community characteristics indicated that they devoted a different percentage of their coordination time to selected activities than did all the coordinators studied. The statistical analysis yielded the following results:[4]

1. Teacher-coordinators from area vocational schools devoted a *smaller percentage* of their coordination time to establishing and maintaining good working relationships with personnel of the business firm than did coordinators from comprehensive high schools.
2. Teacher-coordinators from area vocational schools devoted a *smaller percentage* of their coordination time to working on in-school activities than did coordinators from comprehensive high schools.
3. Teacher-coordinators with three or more years of experience devoted a *smaller percentage* of their coordination time to explaining the training program and the role of the employer and training sponsor than did coordinators with less extensive experience.
4. Teacher-coordinators with one year of experience devoted a *smaller percentage* of their coordination time to working with training sponsors and/or employers in implementing on-the-job training plans than did coordinators with more than one year of experience.
5. Teacher-coordinators with three or more years of experience devoted a *smaller percentage* of their coordination time to explaining the training program than did coordinators with less than three years' experience.
6. Teacher-coordinators who did not work with employers and/or training sponsors to develop and implement training plans devoted a *smaller percentage* of their coordination time to working with training sponsors and/or employers in implementing on-the-job training plans than did coordinators who work with training plans.

IDENTIFICATION OF AREAS OF CONCERN TO EMPLOYERS AND EDUCATORS

Employers identified the major problems with which the school confronts them that make it dif-

[3]See Appendix B for data listing employers who participated in the study by type of business and number to distributive education students trained during the past two years.

[4]See Appendix C for listing of classification data by teacher-coordinator experience and type of school in which distributive education program is located.

TABLE 4

EMPLOYERS ASKED: What are the major problems with which the school confronts you that make it difficult to train distributive education students?

COORDINATORS ASKED: What are the major problems with which employers confront you that make it difficult to provide quality instruction in distributive education?

EMPLOYERS		COORDINATORS	
N=474		N=492	
YES–101 (21.3%) NO–362 (76.4%) NO RESPONSE–11 (2.3%)		YES–289 (58.7%) NO–192 (39.0%) NO RESPONSE–11 (2.2%)	
RANK ORDER	PROBLEM	RANK ORDER	PROBLEM
1	Students view the program primarily as a way to earn money and are not serious about being productive workers	1	Employers desire students having higher ability and interest level than those enrolling in the program
2	Students are not available when needed	2	Students are not employed throughout school year because of budgetary restrictions
3	Students view the program as an easy way to get out of school	3	Inadequate on-the-job training provided
4	Classroom experiences are not effectively related to on-the-job training	4*	Students are needed for employment at odd time of day
5	Students are not properly selected by teacher-coordinator	5	A wage payment plan to encourage students is not provided

TABLE 4

EMPLOYERS ASKED: What are the major problems with which the school confronts you that make it difficult to train distributive education students?

COORDINATORS ASKED: What are the major problems with which employers confront you that make it difficult to provide quality instruction in distributive education?

EMPLOYERS		COORDINATORS	
N=474		N=492	
YES–101 (21.3%) NO–362 (76.4%) NO RESPONSE–11 (2.3%)		YES–289 (58.7%) NO–192 (39.0%) NO RESPONSE–11 (2.2%)	
RANK ORDER	PROBLEM	RANK ORDER	PROBLEM
6	Number of qualified students available for employment is inadequate	6	Training sponsors not willing to spend needed amount of time with coordinator
7	School requirements of minimum hours of employment per week	7	Management's communicating the objectives of the program to the personnel actually working with the students
8	Students have too many extra-curricular activities	8	Dress and grooming requirements
9	Coordinator visits are not carefully planned		
10	Coordinator pressures you to offer more training positions for distributive education students		
11	Coordinator visits are too time consuming		

ficult to train distributive education students. Teacher-coordinators indicated the major problems with which employers confront them. Data in Table 4 show that 289 (58.7 percent) teacher-coordinators and only 101 (21.3 percent) employers indicated that major problems did exist which limited the effectiveness of the distributive education program. The most frequently mentioned problem area indicated by the 101 employers was that students view the program primarily as a way to earn money and are not serious about being productive workers. The 11 problem areas in terms of frequency of mention are shown in Table 4. A number of the problems are closely related and have major implications for improving the distributive education programs using the cooperative plan.

The problem most frequently mentioned by employers is related to their desire for students to have higher ability and interest levels than do those students currently enrolling in the cooperative education program. Table 4 also contains a list of the other problems that employers present to teacher-coordinators according to frequency of mention. Experienced teacher-coordinators work diligently each year to minimize these and other related problems so that their students receive the best possible on-the-job training.

The statistical analysis of the data by teacher-coordinator and employer classification yielded the following two significant findings:

1. Teacher-coordinators who worked without employers and/or training sponsors to develop and implement training plans indicated that there were *more major problems* which employers presented to them that caused some difficulty in developing an effective distributive education program than did coordinators who worked with training plans.
2. Employers representing firms (a) with less than 25 employees and (b) that had trained less than four distributive education students over the past two years indicated *more frequently* that the school did confront them with problems which made it difficult for them to develop an effective training program than did employers with larger numbers of employees and employers who had trained more than four students over the past two years.

Data in Table 5 show that a relatively small percentage (16.5) of the employers surveyed felt that policies and/or management decisions of their firm made it difficult for them to train distributive education students. The 78 employers who did indicate that problems existed reported that the major concern was budgetary controls.

The analysis of the data by employer classification information yielded the following statistically significant finding:

> Employers with more than 25 employees indicated that major policies and management decisions of their firms made it *more difficult* to develop an effective program for training distributive education students than did employers representing firms with less than 25 employees.

Teacher-coordinators surveyed indicated that they more frequently had problems with the policies, practices, philosophies, or attitudes in their school than with employers in business. Approximately 65 percent of the coordinators indicated that a school problem area existed that made it difficult to provide quality instruction in distributive education.

The most frequently mentioned problems were those related to the recruitment of qualified students into the program. A rank order listing of the other problems is contained in Table 5.

COMPETENCIES OF DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION STUDENT/TRAINEES

Employers were asked to indicate the level of competency development that high school students need for employment as student/trainees in the cooperative-plan distributive education program. The employers surveyed indicated the preferred level of student development in the 17 selected competency areas using the following scale: 1 = extensive; 2 = acquaintanceship; and 3 = none. Teacher-coordinators used the same scale to indicate the competencies actually possessed by students who entered employment initially as distributive education students. It is important to note that in many distributive education programs, students have not had any formal school instruction in distribution and marketing before entering employment.

Table 6 shows the relationship between the competencies employers feel distributive education students should possess and the competencies teacher-coordinators indicated their students did in fact possess. Data in the mean value columns show that employers desired students to have a higher level of proficiency than they actually did possess in all competency areas except (a) understanding of how goods and services get from producer to consumer, (b) written communications, (c) job opportunities in marketing and distribution, (d) distribution in the free enterprise system, (e) advertising, and (f) buying.

The rank order data columns show that differences do exist between the competencies students do possess upon entering employment as distributive education students and those competencies desired by employers. The following competencies were ranked higher by employers: acceptence and adherence to company policies, knowledge of products or services, salesmanship, and public relations.

Analysis of Data by Employer Groups

Some competencies were indicated as being more important by some employer groups. The analysis of data indicated that the following findings were statistically significant:[5]

1. Employers operating businesses classified as (a) wholesale, (b) service establishments,

[5]See Appendix B for data listing employers who participated in study by nature, type, and location of business.

TABLE 5

EMPLOYERS ASKED: What policies and/or management decisions of your firm make it difficult to train distributive education students?

COORDINATORS ASKED: What policies, practices, philosophies, or attitudes in your school make it difficult to provide quality instruction in distributive education?

EMPLOYERS		COORDINATORS	
N=474		N=492	
YES–78 (16.5%) NO–384 (81%) NO RESPONSE–12 (2.5%)		YES–317 (64.4%) NO–162 (32.9%) NO RESPONSE–13 (2.6%)	
RANK ORDER	PROBLEM	RANK ORDER	PROBLEM
1	Budgetary controls	1	Inability to recruit qualified students
2	Age requirements for employees	2	Ineffective or nonexistent plan for vocational counseling
3	Inflexibility	3	Indifferent attitude of faculty and administration toward program
4	Union requirements	4	Inability to secure necessary materials, supplies, and equipment
		5	Inadequate time for coordination activities
		6	Assignment to activities not related to distributive education during coordination time
		7	Discouragement from or inability to devote time and effort to youth group activities

TABLE 6

EMPLOYERS ASKED: What competencies should students possess upon entering employment as distributive education student/trainees?

COORDINATORS ASKED: What competencies do students possess upon entering employment as distributive education student/trainees?

N=440 EMPLOYERS			N=490 COORDINATORS	
MEAN*	RANK ORDER†	COMPETENCY	RANK ORDER†	MEAN*
1.224	1.5	Following directions	1	1.865
1.242	1.5	Acceptance and adherence to company policies	9	2.302
1.429	3	Working with people	2.5	2.023
1.489	4	Oral communications	2.5	1.961
1.687	5	Knowledge of products or services	9	2.315
1.801	6	Salesmanship	9	2.215
1.908	7.5	Public relations	14.5	2.448
1.924	7.5	Mathematics of business	5	2.137
2.025	9	Nonselling duties	9	2.372
2.139	10	Understanding of how goods and services get from producer to consumer	5	2.103
2.200	13	Decision making	14.5	2.500
2.218	13	Display	14.5	2.519
2.238	13	Written communications	5	2.135
2.260	13	Job opportunities in marketing and distribution	9	2.236
2.388	13	Distribution in the free enterprise system	9	2.247
2.564	16	Advertising	14.5	2.476
2.670	17	Buying	17	2.590

*Code for Mean Values: 1=Extensive; 2=Acquaintanceship; 3=None
†Two-Tailed T Tests Used to Determine Rank Order.

and (c) those which are located in a downtown shopping area indicated that the students who are to be employed as a part of the distributive education program need a *more extensive* degree of understanding and preparation in the written communications competency area than did other employers.

2. Employers in food distribution indicated that students need a *less extensive* degree of understanding and preparation in the written communications competency area than did other employers.
3. Employers operating businesses classified as (a) general merchandise, (b) apparel and accessories, (c) retail, and (d) those which are located in a shopping center indicated that students need a *more extensive* degree of understanding and preparation in the salesmanship competency area than did other employers.
4. Employers operating businesses classified as (a) food distribution and (b) other indicated that students need a *less extensive* degree of understanding and preparation in the salesmanship competency area than did other employers.
5. Employers operating businesses classified as wholesale indicated that students need a *less extensive* degree of understanding and preparation in the advertising competency area than did other employers.
6. Employers operating businesses classified as (a) apparel and accessories, (b) food service, (c) food distribution, (d) retail, and (e) those which are located in shopping centers indicated that the students need a *more extensive* degree of understanding and preparation in the display competency area than did other employers.
7. Employers operating businesses classified as (a) general merchandise establishments and (b) those which are located in shopping centers indicated that the students need a *more extensive* degree of understanding and preparation in the buying competency area than did other employer groups.
8. Employers operating businesses classified as automotive indicated that the students need a *more extensive* degree of understanding and preparation in the decision-making competency area than did other employer groups.
9. Employers operating businesses classified as (a) apparel and accessories, (b) food distribution, and (c) retail indicated that students need a *more extensive* degree of understanding and preparation in the job opportunities in marketing and distribution competency area than did other employer groups.
10. Employers operating businesses classified as retail trade; other indicated that students need a *less extensive* degree of understanding and preparation in the job opportunities in marketing and distribution competency area than did other employer groups.
11. Employers operating businesses classified as (a) food service and (b) food distribution indicated that students need a *more extensive* degree of understanding and preparation in the understanding of how goods and services get from producer to consumer competency area than did other employer groups.
12. Employers operating businesses classified as general merchandise indicated that students need a *less extensive* degree of understanding and preparation in the understanding of how goods and services get from producer to consumer competency area than did other employer groups.

Analysis of Data by Teacher-Coordinator Groups

The statistical analysis of the data showed that a significantly larger proportion of teacher-coordinators with common personal, program, school, and community characteristics responded to the competencies studied. The statistical analysis yielded the following results:[6]

1. Teacher-coordinators with two years' experience indicated that the typical student entering the cooperative phase of the distributive education program has *more extensive* preparation in the following competency areas than did coordinators with other amounts of coordinating experience: (a) oral communications; (b) advertising; (c) distribution in the free enterprise system; and (d) display.
2. Teacher-coordinators from suburban schools indicated that the typical student entering the cooperative phase of the distributive education program has *more extensive* preparation in the following competency areas than did coordinators from schools in other types of locations: (a) buying; (b) nonselling duties; (c) decision making; (d) distribution in the free enterprise system; (e) job opportunities in marketing and distribution; (f) understanding of how goods and services get from producer to consumer; (g) display; (h) knowledge of products or services; and (i) salesmanship.
3. Teacher-coordinators from city schools indicated that the typical student entering the cooperative phase of the distributive education program *has not had any* preparation in the following competency areas as compared to the coordinators from schools in other types of locations: (a) distribution in the free enterprise system; and (b) job opportunities in marketing and distribution.
4. Teacher-coordinators from comprehensive high schools indicated that the typical student entering the cooperative phase of the distributive education program has had *more extensive* preparation in knowledge of products or

[6]See Appendix C for listing of classification data by teacher-coordinator experience, type of school, and location of school in which there are distributive education programs.

services competency area than coordinators in area vocational schools.

5. Teacher-coordinators with less than three years' experience indicated more frequently than coordinators with more experience that the typical student entering the cooperative phase of the distributive education program *has not developed* competency in written communication.
6. Teacher-coordinators from area vocational schools indicated that the typical student entering the cooperative phase of the distributive education program has had *more extensive* preparation in the advertising and buying competency areas than did coordinators from comprehensive high schools.

COMPETENCIES OF DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION GRADUATES

Employers used the following three-point scale to indicate the extent to which distributive education graduates should possess selected competencies: 1 = extensive; 2 = acquaintanceship; 3 = none. Using the same scale, teacher-coordinators indicated the level to which their students developed the 17 competencies.

Data in Table 7 show that with the exception of (a) following directions, (b) acceptance and adherence to company policies and procedures, and (c) working with people, the teacher-coordinators indicated that their students possessed the 17 competencies at a higher level of proficiency than employers indicated that students should possess them.

Rank order data in Table 7 show that employers place higher priorities on the following competencies when compared with those which distributive education graduates possess: (a) following directions; (b) acceptance and adherence to company policies and procedures; (c) oral communications; (d) public relations; (e) mathematics of business; (f) decision making; and (g) written communication.

Analysis of Data by Employer Groups

A number of the competencies were considered to be more important by employer groups. The analysis of data indicated that the following findings are statistically significant:[7]

1. Employers in (a) wholesale and (b) service-type businesses indicated that individuals who are to be employed as full-time workers need a *more extensive* understanding and preparation in the written communications competency area than did employers in the field of retailing.
2. Employers in the food distribution field indicated that individuals who are to be employed as full-time workers need a *less extensive* understanding and preparation in the written communications competency area than did employers in other types of businesses.
3. Employees who have trained four or more students over the past two years indicated that individuals who are to be employed as full-time workers need a *more extensive* preparation in the competency area of understanding how goods and services get from producer to consumer than did employers who had not participated as extensively in the distributive education program.
4. Employers operating businesses classified as general merchandise indicated that individuals who are to be employed as full-time workers need a *more extensive* understanding and preparation in the mathematics of business competency area than did employers operating other types of businesses.
5. Employers operating businesses with 25 or less employees indicated that individuals who are to be employed as full-time workers need a *more extensive* understanding and preparation in the nonselling duties competency area than did employers with a larger number of employees.
6. Employers operating businesses classified as (a) service versus wholesale and retail and (b) other indicated that individuals who are to be employed as full-time workers need a *more extensive* understanding and preparation in the decision-making competency area than did employers in other types of businesses.
7. Employers operating businesses classified as (a) general merchandise, (b) retail, and (c) those which are located in shopping centers indicated that individuals who are to be employed as full-time workers need a *more extensive* understanding and preparation in the buying competency area than did other employer groups.
8. Employers operating businesses with 25 or less employees indicated that individuals who are to be employed as full-time workers need a *more extensive* understanding and preparation in the knowledge of products or services competency area than did employers with larger numbers of employees.
9. Employers operating businesses classified as (a) general merchandise, (b) food distribution, (c) retail, (d) those with 25 or less employees, and (e) those which are located in shopping centers indicated that individuals who are to be employed as full-time workers need a *more extensive* understanding and preparation in the display competency area than did other employers.
10. Employers operating businesses classified as (a) general merchandise, (b) retail, and (c) those which are located in shopping centers, (d) neighborhood shopping areas, and (e) which have 25 or less employees indicated that individuals who are to be employed as full-time workers need a *more extensive* un-

[7]See Appendix B for listing of employers data by nature and type of business, number of employees, and location of business.

TABLE 7

EMPLOYERS ASKED: What competencies should distributive education graduates possess for employment ?

COORDINATORS ASKED: What competencies are possessed by distributive education graduates?

EMPLOYERS		COMPETENCY	COORDINATORS	
MEAN*	RANK ORDER†		RANK ORDER†	MEAN*
AVERAGE N=375			AVERAGE N=490	
1.125	1	Following directions	6	1.290
1.138	2	Acceptance and adherence to company policies and procedures	4	1.254
1.256	3	Working with people	1	1.129
1.332	4	Oral communications	8	1.326
1.375	5	Knowledge of products or services	6	1.290
1.479	6	Salesmanship	2	1.188
1.658	7	Public relations	11	1.500
1.688	8	Mathematics of business	12.5	1.541
1.798	9	Decision making	15	1.744
1.825	10	Nonselling duties	10	1.436
1.915	11.5	Understanding of how goods and services get from producer to consumer	3	1.232
1.947	11.5	Written communications	17	1.793
1.955	13	Display	14	1.563
2.163	14	Job opportunities in marketing and distribution	6	1.301
2.193	15	Distribution in the free enterprise system	9	1.389
2.254	16	Buying	16	1.765
2.315	17	Advertising	12.5	1.541

*Code for Mean Values: 1=Extensive; 2=Acquaintanceship; 3=None
†Two-Tailed T Tests Used to Determine Rank Order

TABLE 8

COMPETENCIES WHICH (1) Coordinators indicated that students who graduate from the distributive education program do possess

and

(2) Employers indicated that individuals employed full-time should possess at a significantly higher level than those competencies students entering the cooperative phase of the distributive education program possess*

Employers N=474	Coordinators N=492
Working with people	Knowledge of products or services
Written communication	Advertising
Oral communication	Public relations
Salesmanship	Nonselling duties
Display	Distribution in the free enterprise system
Buying	Understanding of how goods and services get from the producer to the consumer
Decision making	Mathematics in business
Job opportunities in marketing and distribution	Following directions
Acceptance and adherence to company policies	

*Two-Tailed T Tests Used to Determine if Statistically Significant

TABLE 9

EMPLOYERS ASKED: What are the reasons for your firm's participation in a distributive education program?

COORDINATORS ASKED: Why do firms participate in a distributive education program?

EMPLOYERS RANK ORDER* N=470	REASONS	COORDINATORS RANK ORDER* N=492
1	To secure part-time workers	1
2	To train students for careers with firm	3
3	To be involved in an educational program to prepare youth for careers in field of distribution	3
4	To train students for careers in that type of business	3
5	To comply with directive from company headquarters to hire distributive education students	5

*Two-Tailed T Tests Used to Determine Rank Order

derstanding and preparation in the salesmanship competency area than did other employer groups.

11. Employers who classified their businesses as other indicated that individuals who are to be employed as full-time workers need a *less extensive* understanding and preparation in the salesmanship and display competency areas than did employers operating other types of businesses.
12. Employers operating businesses classified as (a) automotive, (b) food distribution, and (c) retail indicated that individuals who are to be employed as full-time workers need a *more extensive* understanding and preparation in the job opportunities in marketing and distribution competency area than did other employers.
13. Employers operating businesses classified as other indicated that individuals who are to be employed as full-time workers need a *less extensive* understanding and preparation in the competency areas of job opportunities in marketing and distribution and understanding of how goods and services get from producer to consumer than did employers operating other types of businesses.
14. Employers operating businesses classified as wholesale firms indicated that individuals who are to be employed as full-time workers need a *less extensive* understanding and preparation in the advertising competency area than did employers operating retail and service-type businesses.

Analysis of Data By Teacher-Coordinator Groups

The statistical analysis of the data showed that a significantly larger proportion of teacher-coordinators with certain personal, program, school, and community characteristics teach competencies at a different level of student performance than do all coordinators as a group. The statistical analysis yielded the following results:[8]

1. Teacher-coordinators who work with employers and/or training sponsors to develop and implement training plans indicated that the typical student who graduates from the distributive education program has had *more extensive* preparation in the following competency areas than did coordinators who did not work with training plans: (a) written communications; (b) knowledge of products or services; (c) decision making; and (d) following directions.
2. Teacher-coordinators who teach in inner-city schools indicated that the typical student who graduates from the distributive education program has had *more extensive* preparation in the distribution in the free enterprise competency area than did coordinators from schools in other locations.
3. Teacher-coordinators with one year of experience indicated that the typical student who graduates from the distributive education program has had *less extensive* understanding of and preparation in the following competency areas than did coordinators with more than one year of experience: (a) written communications; (b) decision making; (c) mathematics of business; and (d) following directions.

Relationship Between Competencies Needed by Student/Trainees and Those Needed by Full-Time Employees

The data in Table 8 show that business firms do prefer to employ individuals who have developed all 17 of the competencies studied in this research to a higher level than that which student/trainees possess upon entering the cooperative phase of the distributive education program. Based upon the statistical analysis of the data, teacher-coordinators can feel confident in assisting students who plan to enter the field of distribution and marketing in developing the 17 competencies listed in Table 8.

REASONS FOR BUSINESS PARTICIPATION IN DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION

A significantly large number of employers and teacher-coordinators indicated that the major reason businesses participate in the cooperative distributive education program is to secure part-time workers. The results of the statistical analysis of the teacher-coordinator and employer data are shown in Table 9.

The reasons given to indicate why employers participate in the cooperative distributive education program by various teacher-coordinator groups were analyzed.[9] The statistical analysis yielded the following results:

1. A significantly larger percentage of the teacher-coordinators with advisory committees than those without advisory committees indicated that employers participate in the distributive education program for the following two reasons: (a) to train students for future positions in their type of business; and (b) to be involved in an educational program to prepare youth for future positions in the field of distribution.
2. A significantly larger proportion of the teacher-coordinators who work with employers and/or training sponsors to develop and implement training plans than those who do not indicated that employers participate in the distributive education program for the following three reasons: (a) to be involved in an educational program to prepare youth for future positions in the field of distribution; (b) to train students for future positions with their firms; and (c) to

[8]See Appendix C for listing of classification data by teacher-coordinator experience and location of schools in which there are distributive education programs.

[9]See Appendix C for listing of classification data by teacher-coordinator experience and location of schools in which there are distributive education programs.

TABLE 10

EMPLOYERS ASKED: What contact techniques are effective in influencing your firm to participate in a distributive education program?

COORDINATORS ASKED: What contact techniques do you use to secure employer participation in a distributive education program?

EMPLOYERS RANK ORDER* N=215	TECHNIQUE	COORDINATORS RANK ORDER* N=248
1	Personal visit by coordinator	1
2	Telephone contact from school	3.5
3	Telephone request to school	2
4	School placement counselor	7.5
5	Employer presently cooperating	3.5
6	Advisory committee member	6
7	Chamber of commerce	9
9	Merchant or trade organization	7.5
9	Employer request following a civic/service club program	5
9	State employment service	10

*Two-Tailed T Tests Used to Determine Rank Order

TABLE 11

EMPLOYERS ASKED: What procedure do you prefer for the selection of distributive education students?

COORDINATORS ASKED: What procedure is followed in placing distributive education students in a training station?

EMPLOYERS RANK ORDER* N=220	TECHNIQUE	COORDINATORS RANK ORDER* N=244
1	Coordinator selects several qualified students to apply; final selection left to employer	1
2	Coordinator refers a student who meets the requirements of employment; final acceptance the decision of employer	2
3	Coordinator sends several students who wish employment; final selection left to employer	3
4	Student seeks his own job opportunity without referral by coordinator	4

*Two-Tailed T Tests Used to Determine Rank Order

TABLE 12

EMPLOYERS ASKED: What is the desired frequency of coordination visits?

COORDINATORS ASKED: What is the frequency of coordination calls?

EMPLOYERS		TIME INTERVAL OF COORDINATION VISITS	COORDINATORS	
PERCENTAGE	RANK ORDER*		RANK ORDER*	MEAN
N=249			N=244	
39.4	1	Once every month	2.5	2.574
26.5	2	Once each grading period	2.5	2.484
10.0	3	Once each semester	5	3.045
8.0	4	Only when problem to be solved	6	3.180
6.4	5	Every three weeks	2.5	2.553
6.0	6	Every two weeks or less	2.5	2.525
3.6		Other		

*Two-Tailed T Tests Used to Determine Rank Order

train students for future positions in their type of business.

3. A significantly larger proportion of coordinators with more than one year of experience indicated that employers participate in the distributive education program to train students for future positions with their firms than did coordinators with less experience.
4. A significantly larger proportion of inner-city teacher-coordinators than rural-area teacher-coordinators indicated that employers participate in the distributive education program because of directives from company headquarters.
5. A significantly larger proportion of the teacher-coordinators who work with employers and/or training sponsors to develop and implement training plans indicated that employers train students for future positions with their firm.

TECHNIQUES FOR SECURING TRAINING STATIONS

Data in Table 10 show that the employers indicated that a personal visit by the teacher-coordinator was the most effective technique for influencing business participation in the distributive education program. Likewise, coordinators indicated they most frequently use the personal-approach technique in securing employer participation. However, the rank order data does show that some differences exist between what techniques were effective in influencing employer participation and the frequency with which coordinators used those techniques. The following techniques ranked higher in the employer data column: (a) telephone contact from school, (b) school placement counselor and (c) chamber of commerce.

STUDENT PLACEMENT PROCEDURES

Teacher-coordinators and employers are in complete agreement on the preferred procedures to be followed in the placement process. Data in Table 11 show that the rank order is identical, beginning with the coordinator's selection of students and the final selection being left to the employer.

FREQUENCY OF COORDINATION VISITS

Rank order data in Table 12 show that employers prefer to have the teacher-coordinator visit once every month. Teacher-coordinators indicated in almost equal numbers the following four intervals for coordination visits: (1) once every month; (2) once each grading period; (3) every two weeks; and (4) every three weeks. Only a small percentage of the employers indicated that they desired to have coordination visits more often than once a month. Research and published materials on cooperative vocational education concur with the practices of the coordinators surveyed in this study.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES IN FIRM AND TRAINING EFFECTIVENESS

Data in Table 13 show that 38.9 percent of the teacher-coordinators surveyed indicated that employers and personnel in firms with two to ten employees provide the most effective training for distributive education students. The data also show that a larger percentage (30.7) of the employers who participated in the study employed two to ten employees. Likewise, it is also important to note that there are significantly more employers in the United States who employ two to ten employees than any other number of employees.

The analysis of the data according to the teacher-coordinator classification information yielded the following statistically significant finding:

> Teacher-coordinators from high schools located in rural areas indicated more frequently that firms with two to ten employees provided the most effective on-the-job training for the distributive education students than did coordinators from school located in inner-city, city, or suburban areas.

PREFERENCES AND PRACTICES IN EMPLOYMENT OF STUDENTS

Data in Tables 14 through 19 show the when-and-how phase of the employment of cooperative-plan students. Table 14 data show that differences do exist between the practices of teacher-coordinators and preferences of employers concerning the months of the year for employment of distributive education students. A majority of the employers surveyed indicated that they prefer to employ distributive education students from June through the senior year to graduation time. Teacher-coordinators indicated that students are available for employment under school supervision only from September to graduation time.

A further analysis of the data by employer and teacher-coordinator characteristics revealed one statistically significant comparison: a significantly smaller proportion of the employers in the apparel and accessories field indicated that they prefer to employ distributive education students during the nine-month period from September to June and the twelve-month period from June to June than did employers in other types of businesses.

A majority of the firms prefer to employ cooperative distributive education students five days a week. The coordinator rank order data in Table 15 also show that significantly more of the teacher-coordinators indicated that their students do work five days a week. Data in Table 16 show that approximately 75 percent of the employers prefer to have

TABLE 13

EMPLOYERS ASKED: How many employees work in this firm (one location only)?

COORDINATORS ASKED: Employers and personnel in which size firm provide most effective training for distributive education students?

EMPLOYERS		NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES	COORDINATORS	
N	PERCENTAGE		RANK ORDER*	PERCENTAGE
N=472			N=470	
145	30.7	2-10 employees	1	38.9
91	19.3	10-25 employees	2	27.4
101	21.4	26-75 employees	3	19.1
49	10.3	76-150 employees	4	6.2
86	18.2	More than 150 employees	4	8.3

*Two-Tailed T Tests Used to Determine Rank Order

TABLE 14

EMPLOYERS ASKED: What months of the year do you prefer to employ distributive education students?

COORDINATORS ASKED: What months of the year are students employed under school supervision?

EMPLOYERS		MONTHS	COORDINATORS	
PERCENTAGE	RANK ORDER†		RANK ORDER†	MEAN*
N=474			N=439	
60.3	1	June through graduation (summer plus school year)	2	3.219
19.2	2	September through graduation (school year only)	1	1.553
2.3	3	September through December (first semester only)	3.5	3.764
3.0	4	September through December and March through June	6	4.018
1.3	5	June through December and March through June	5	3.943
.4	6	January through graduation (second semester only)	3.5	3.776
13.1		Other		
.4		No response		

*Code for Mean Values: 1=Always; 2=Usually; 3=Sometimes; 4=Seldom; 5=Never
†Two-Tailed T Tests Used to Determine Rank Order

TABLE 15

EMPLOYERS ASKED: How many days per week would you prefer to schedule distributive education students?

COORDINATORS ASKED: How many days per week do distributive education students work?

EMPLOYERS			COORDINATORS	
PERCENTAGE	RANK ORDER†	NUMBER OF DAYS PER WEEK	RANK ORDER†	MEAN*
52.4	1	5 days	1	2.209
31.6	2	3-4 days	2	2.582
13.2	3	6 days	3	3.053
2.0	4	7 days	5	3.955
.8	5	1-2 days	4	3.361

*Code for Mean Values: 1=Always; 2=Usually; 3=Sometimes; 4=Seldom; 5=Never

†Two-Tailed T Tests Used to Determine Rank Order

TABLE 16

EMPLOYERS ASKED: What time of day do you prefer to schedule distributive education students to work?

COORDINATORS ASKED: What time of day are students available for work?

EMPLOYERS		TIME OF DAY	COORDINATORS	
PERCENTAGE	RANK ORDER†		RANK ORDER†	MEAN*
N=249			N=244	
48.6	1	Afternoon hours	1	1.463
26.5	2	Evening hours	2	2.053
8.8	3	Morning hours	4	3.758
6.4	4	Split shift	3	3.373
9.6		Other		

*Code for Mean Values: 1=Always; 2=Usually; 3=Sometimes; 4=Seldom; 5=Never

†Two-Tailed T Tests Used to Determine Rank Order

TABLE 17

EMPLOYERS ASKED: How many hours per week do you prefer to schedule distributive education students for work?

COORDINATORS ASKED: How many hours per week do employers schedule distributive education students for work?

EMPLOYERS		HOURS PER WEEK	COORDINATORS	
PERCENTAGE	RANK ORDER†		RANK ORDER†	MEAN*
N=250			N=244	
73.6	1	16-25 hours	1	2.066
15.6	2	26-35 hours	2	2.758
9.2	3	15 hours or less	3	3.111
1.6	4	More than 35 hours	4	3.615

*Code for Mean Values: 1=Always; 2=Usually; 3=Sometimes; 4=Seldom; 5=Never
†Two-Tailed T Tests Used to Determine Rank Order

TABLE 18

EMPLOYERS ASKED: What is the basis for determining the hours distributive education students are to be employed?

COORDINATORS ASKED: What is the basis used by employers to determine the hours distributive education students are to be employed?

EMPLOYERS RANK ORDER†	BASIS FOR DETERMINING STUDENT WORK HOURS	COORDINATORS RANK ORDER†
N=215		N=248
1	Availability of student	4
2	Regular weekly schedule	1.5
3	Peak-hour needs	1.5
4	Consultation with teacher-coordinator	3
5	Personnel needs on a day-to-day basis	6
6	Hours for which it is difficult to hire part-time employees	5

†Two-Tailed T Tests Used to Determine Rank Order

30

TABLE 19

EMPLOYERS ASKED: What is the preferred wage payment plan for distributive education students?

COORDINATORS ASKED: On what wage payment plan are distributive education students paid?

EMPLOYERS		WAGE PAYMENT PLAN	COORDINATORS	
PERCENTAGE	RANK ORDER†		RANK ORDER†	MEAN*
N=248			N=244	
39.9	1	Same wage as paid to any other employee for same job assignment	1.5	2.057
24.2	2	Same wage as paid to any other student	1.5	2.004
17.3	3	Production and performance of student	4	3.074
10.5	4	Union scale	3	2.406
3.6	5	Higher wage than paid to student not in training program	5	3.426
.8	6	Lower wage than paid to student not in training program	6	4.029
3.6		Other		

*Code for Mean Values: 1=Always; 2=Usually; 3=Sometimes; 4=Seldom; 5=Never
†Two-Tailed T Tests Used to Determine Rank Order

TABLE 20

EMPLOYERS ASKED: What personal characteristics are desirable in distributive education students?

COORDINATORS ASKED: What personal characteristics are possessed by distributive education students?

EMPLOYERS		TYPE OF CHARACTERISTIC	COORDINATORS	
MEAN*	RANK ORDER†		RANK ORDER†	MEAN*
AVERAGE N=215			AVERAGE N=248	
1.046	1	Honesty	1	1.758
1.069	2	Dependability	6	2.169
1.152	3.5	Punctuality	6	2.169
1.159	3.5	Cooperation	2.5	1.931
1.221	6	Desire to learn	11	2.371
1.245	6	Neat appearance	2.5	1.940
1.275	6	Pleasant personality	4	2.077
1.400	9.5	Positive attitude	11	2.363
1.408	9.5	Initiative	11	2.456
1.410	9.5	Industriousness	11	2.403
1.455	9.5	Mental maturity	11	2.391
1.524	12	Tact	14	2.589
1.653	13	Self-confidence	11	2.423
1.774	14	Physical maturity	6	2.145

*Code for Mean Values: 1=Extensive; 2=Acquaintanceship; 3=None

†Two-Tailed T Tests Used to Determine Rank Order

31

TABLE 21

EMPLOYERS ASKED: What personal characteristics are desirable in full-time employees?

COORDINATORS ASKED: What personal characteristics are possessed by distributive education graduates?

EMPLOYERS		TYPE OF CHARACTERISTIC	COORDINATORS	
MEAN*	RANK ORDER†		RANK ORDER†	MEAN*
AVERAGE N=182			AVERAGE N=248	
1.022	1.5	Honesty	1	1.552
1.027	1.5	Dependability	4	1.746
1.086	3	Punctuality	4	1.742
1.125	7	Cooperation	4	1.706
1.153	7	Neat appearance	4	1.645
1.191	7	Desire to learn	14	2.040
1.196	7	Initiative	11.5	1.992
1.213	7	Pleasant personality	8	1.879
1.225	7	Industriousness	11.5	1.964
1.263	7	Mental maturity	11.5	2.000
1.279	7	Positive attitude	9	1.899
1.264	12.5	Tact	11.5	2.004
1.276	12.5	Self-confidence	4	1.723
1.588	14	Physical maturity	7	1.835

*Code for Mean Values: 1=Extensive; 2=Acquaintanceship; 3=None

†Two-Tailed T Tests Used to Determine Rank Order

TABLE 22

PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS WHICH (1) Teacher-coordinators indicated that students who graduated from the distributive education program do possess

and

(2) Employers indicated that individuals employed full-time should possess at a significantly higher level than those personal characteristics students entering the cooperative phase of the distributive education program possess*

Employer N=182	Coordinator N=248
Neat appearance	Physical maturity
Mental maturity	Industriousness
Initiative	Pleasant personality
Punctuality	Cooperation
Tact	Self-confidence

*Two-Tailed T Tests Used to Determine if Statistically Significant

students work during afternoon or evening hours. The fact that approximately 15 percent of the employers prefer to have students work during morning hours or split shift is worthy of serious consideration by teacher-coordinators.

Rank order data are identical for the number of hours per week that employers prefer to schedule students to work and the number of hours per week that distributive education students do work. Data in Table 17 show that employers prefer and usually do schedule distributive education students to work 16 to 25 hours per week.

A larger number of employers indicated that they used the criterion of the availability of the student as a basis of determining working hours more than any other criterion. Data in Table 18 show that teacher-coordinators indicated that employers use either a regular weekly schedule or peak-hour needs schedule as the basis for determining the working hours. Availability of students received a composite rank order rating of four by the 248 coordinators responding to the question of how students work hours are determined.

Employers and teacher-coordinators data are also very similar on the wage payment plan for distributive education students. The practice of following a wage payment plan whereby the distributive education student is paid the same wage as any other employee for the same job assignment is preferred by employers. Coordinators indicated in almost equal proportions that distributive education students are either on the wage plan preferred by the employers surveyed or receive the same wage as any other student (see Table 19).

PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION STUDENT/TRAINEES

Employers indicated the level of development of personal characteristics that high school students need for employment in the cooperative distributive education program. The employers surveyed indicated the preferred level of development by using the following scale: 1 = extensive; 2 = acquaintanceship; and 3 = none. Teacher-coordinators used the same scale to indicate the personal characteristics initially demonstrated by distributive education students.

Data in Table 20 show the relationship between the personal characteristics employers indicated that students should demonstrate and the personal characteristics teacher-coordinators believe that their students actually do show. Data in the mean value columns show that employers desire all 14 personal characteristics at a higher level than distributive education students possess them. The rank order data columns show that differences do exist between the personal characteristics distributive education students do possess upon entering employment and those desired by employers. The following personal characteristics were ranked higher by employers than by coordinators: dependability, punctuality, desire to learn, and tact.

PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION GRADUATES

Employers indicated the extent to which distributive education graduates should possess selected personal characteristics, using the following scale: 1 = extensive; 2 = acquaintanceship; and 3 = none. Using the identical scale, teacher-coordinators indicated the level to which their students developed the 14 personal characteristics.

Data in Table 21 show that employers desire full-time employees to have all 14 of the personal characteristics at a higher level than what is demonstrated by distributive education graduates. Rank order data show that employers place higher priorities on the following personal characteristics when compared with the characteristics that distributive education graduates possess: dependability, punctuality, desire to learn, initiative, industriousness, mental maturity, and positive attitude.

Data in Table 22 show that 11 of the 14 personal characteristics should be demonstrated at a significantly higher level by graduates of distributive education programs than by students entering the cooperative distributive education program. Teacher-coordinators surveyed indicated that the personal characteristics were developed by their students. The employers contacted specified the need for the development of the 11 personal characteristics.

CHAPTER III
RECOMMENDATIONS

Based upon careful analysis of the data in this study, recommendations are offered to facilitate the growth and development of educational programs using the cooperative plan. While the recommendations are most valid for distributive educators located in the five-state U.S. Office of Education Region V area, it is suggested that they be considered relevant by personnel responsible for developing and implementing all types of programs in cooperative vocational education throughout the United States.

1. The following should be essential operational activities in the cooperative plan:
   (a) A schedule developed by the coordinator and training sponsor for training each student;
   (b) An advisory committee, comprised of members representative of the business community, to advise school officials on program operation;
   (c) Assignment of a specific individual to serve as an on-the-job training sponsor for each distributive education student;
   (d) Training session to prepare training sponsors for their role in training distributive education students;
   (e) Classroom instruction having a relationship to the learning experiences of a student in his training station;
   (f) Training materials for the student to study in school, which are related to his training-station experiences;
   (g) Participation by business representatives in the classroom-instruction phase of the program, i.e. speaker, etc;
   (h) A written training agreement that establishes the responsibilities of student, school, and employer; and
   (i) Participation in DECA youth group activities, i.e. serving as judges for competitive events, making field trips, attending employee-employer banquets.
2. Teacher-coordinators should place increased emphasis on the following three elements of the cooperative plan: training plans, advisory committees, and training sponsors.
3. Teacher-coordinators should devote proportionately more of their coordination time to the implementation of on-the-job training plans and to the solution of students' on-the-job problems.
4. Teacher-coordinators must identify and communicate the goals and objectives of the cooperative distributive education program in terms of expected student outcomes, using the services of counselors, school administrators, and advisory committees.
5. Teacher-coordinators need to develop and implement techniques and procedures for communicating the goals, objectives, and operating procedures so that the distributive education program is understood by all concerned personnel both in the educational and business communities.
6. Teacher-coordinators need to develop and implement a plan of action with key management personnel in distributive businesses and trade associations that will ensure mutual understanding and positive commitment and involvement in the distributive education program.
7. Teacher-coordinators and employers need to carefully examine the reasons for business participation in cooperative-plan distributive education programs and where necessary develop a strategy that will result in appropriate attitude changes.
8. Distributive education curriculums at the secondary school level must be expanded to include a minimum of two years of instruction if the competencies students do possess upon entering employment as distributive education students are to match those desired by employers.
9. Instruction in distributive education should be designed so that students develop the following competencies at a higher level than they are currently: following directions, working with people, and acceptance and adherence to company policies and procedures.
10. The level of development in selected competencies needed by employers in selected locations and types of businesses should be given careful consideration in student career and

curriculum planning.

11. Placement activities must include a review of the competencies and personal characteristics possessed by students in relation to the particular expectations of employers according to type and location of business.
12. The size, location, and type of business should and does provide teacher-coordinators with a base for the planning of individualized instruction.
13. Teacher-coordinators should continue to use the personal coordination visit as the primary technique for securing participation of firms in the program. Other methods should be used only to supplement the personal contact.
14. Coordination visits should be educationally purposeful in nature and carefully planned. The frequency of visits should be justified to employing officials.
15. School personnel should carefully study the need to provide teacher-coordinators with extended contracts so that students can be employed under school supervision during the summer months.
16. School personnel should carefully study the possibility of developing cooperative education with students scheduled for employment at times other than afternoon hours.
17. Personnel in the educational and business communities need to reach an understanding about the kind and degree of personal characteristics which should be possessed by students and graduates. Hopefully, employers will agree upon realistic requirements that can be achieved through appropriate educational experiences.
18. Research should be conducted with employers representing businesses classified as general merchandise firms who do operate and prefer the distributive education program to be operated following the practices and procedures commonly subscribed to by personnel in leadership positions in distributive education in order to determine why they believe, practice, and prefer the program to operate as they do.
19. Research should be conducted with employers representing businesses who have trained more than four distributive education students during the past two years who do operate and prefer the distributive education program to be operated following the practices and procedures commonly subscribed to by personnel in leadership positions in distributive education in order to determine why they believe, practice, and prefer the program to operate as they do.
20. Personnel in the educational and employing communities need to develop meaningful dialogue. This should result in increased participation and cooperation in order that educational programs using the cooperative plan can provide meaningful learning experiences for the students. Problems and concerns that are peculiar to the nature or type of business, number of employees, or other similar business classification data need to be identified and resolved.
21. Each teacher-coordinator working in conjunction with his advisory committee should select and modify questions from the employer survey form used in this study. He should then administer the instrument, compile the results, make recommendations, develop a plan of action, and implement the plan.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

PARTICIPATION IN REGION V DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION RESEARCH BY EMPLOYERS AND TEACHER-COORDINATORS

Summary of Region V Survey Participation Data

	Coordinators		Employers	
	N		*N*	
Forms Mailed	687	%	1086	%
Total Responses Received	496	72.0	544	50.1
Total Usable Responses	492	71.6	474	42.7

Employer Responses by State

State	Mailed	Usable Responses	Percentage Response
Illinois	259	123	47.5
Ohio	316	147	46.5
Wisconsin	42	24	57.1
Indiana	102	50	49.0
Michigan	365	130	35.6
Total	1,086	474	43.6

Employer Responses by Form Number

Form Number	Mailed	Usable Responses	Percentage Response
Form I	545	224	44.3
Form II	541	250	41.1
Total	1,086	474	43.6

Additional Replies Received from Employers

Reply	Number
1. Unable to participate, no specific reason given	25
2. Form not received or received response too late to include in study	21
3. Insufficient knowledge about distributive education program or student	11
4. Owner, employer, training sponsor left firm	7
5. Too busy	6
6. Distributive education student left firm	3
7. Company policy	3
Total	75

Teacher-Coordinator Responses by State

State	Mailed	Useable Responses	Percentage Response
Illinois	167	116	70.6
Indiana	52	37	71.1
Michigan	180	137	76.1
Ohio	236	126	53.4
Wisconsin	50	38	76.0
Total	687	492	71.6

Teacher-Coordinator Responses by Form Number

Form Number	Mailed	Usable Responses	Percentage Response
Form I	347	248	71.5
Form II	340	240	71.8
Total	687	488	71.6

Additional Replies Received from Teacher-Coordinators

Reply	Number
1. Response received too late to include in study	7
2. Not willing to participate in study	1
3. Recently employed and did not feel qualified to complete form	1
Total	9

APPENDIX B

EMPLOYER CLASSIFICATION DATA

Type of Business

N = 474

Retail	Wholesale	Service	No Response
377 (79.5%)	18 (3.8%)	69 (14.6%)	10 (2.1%)

Nature of Business

Classified By U. S. Office of Education Instructional Program Area

N = 474

N	%		N	%	
8	1.7	Advertising Services	4	.8	Industrial Marketing
65	13.7	Apparel and Accessories	1	.2	Insurance
38	8.0	Automotive	1	.2	International Trade
17	3.6	Finance and Credit	7	1.5	Personnel Services
4	.8	Floristry	13	2.7	Petroleum
64	13.5	Food Distribution	0	0	Real Estate
46	9.7	Food Service	1	.2	Recreation/Tourism
164	34.6	General Merchandise	0	0	Transportation
22	4.6	Hardware, Building Materials, Farm and Garden Supplies and Equipment	13	2.7	Wholesale Trade: Other (Please Specify)
			81	17.1	Retail Trade: Other (Please Specify)
15	3.2	Home Furnishings			
			41	8.6	Other (Please Specify)
3	.6	Hotel and Lodging			

Location Of Business

N = 474

N	%	
156	32.9	Downtown Shopping Area
129	27.2	Neighborhood Shopping Area
129	27.2	Shopping Center
58	12.2	Other
2	.4	No Response

Number Of Employees
(One Location Only)

N = 474

N	%	
145	30.6	2-10
91	19.2	11-25
101	21.3	26-75
49	10.3	76-150
86	18.1	More Than 150
2	1.4	No Response

Number of Distributive Education Students Trained over Past Two Years

N = 474

N	%	
254	53.6	Less than 4
96	20.3	4- 6
73	15.4	7-15
10	2.1	16-25
26	5.5	More Than 25
11	2.3	Do Not Know
4	.8	No Response

Employees in Cooperative Employer Firm Who Are Graduates of a Distributive Education Program

N = 474

N	%	
161	34.0	None
153	32.3	1- 2
61	12.9	3- 5
21	4.4	6-10
21	4.4	More Than 10
51	10.8	No Not Know
6	1.3	No Response

Organization Of Business

N = 474

N	%	
90	19.0	Single Proprietorship
23	4.9	Partnership
322	67.9	Corporation
12	2.5	Franchise
5	1.1	Cooperative
17	3.6	Other
5		No Response

Distributive Education Program Employers Working with Advisory Committees

N = 474

N	%	
123	25.9	Yes
107	22.6	No
8	1.7	Majority
224	47.3	Do Not Know
7	1.5	Other
5	1.1	No Response

Distributive Education Employers Working with Cooperatively Developed On-the-Job Training Plans

N = 474

N	%	
172	36.3	Yes
217	45.8	No
7	1.5	Majority
65	13.7	Do Not Know
8	1.7	Other
5	1.1	No Response

Size of Community in Which Business is Located

N = 474

N	%	
67	14.1	Less Than 10,000
149	31.4	10,000-50,000
78	16.5	50,000-100,000
49	10.3	100,000-250,000
24	5.1	250,000-500,000
81	17.1	More Than 500,000
26	5.5	No Response

APPENDIX C

TEACHER-COORDINATOR CLASSIFICATION DATA

Location of School

N = 488

N	%	
59	12.1	Inner City
189	38.7	City
179	36.7	Suburban
61	12.5	Rural

Advisory Committee Recognized by School

N	%	
261	53.0	Yes
220	44.7	No
11	2.2	No Response

Training Plans Developed and Implemented with Employers and/or Training Sponsor

N	%	
386	78.5	Yes
93	18.9	No
13	2.6	No Response

Type of School

N = 485

N	%	
439	90.5	Comprehensive
32	6.6	Area-Vocational
4	.8	Trade-Technical
10	2.1	Other

Number of Years Distributive Education Program in Operation

N = 488

N	%	
111	22.7	Less Than 3 Years
155	31.8	3- 5
107	21.9	6-10
33	6.8	11-15
82	16.8	More Than 15

Approximate School Enrollment Grades 10-12

N = 490

N	%	
51	10.4	Less Than 500
124	25.3	500-1,000
188	38.4	1,001-2,000
97	19.8	2,001-3,000
30	6.1	More Than 3,000

Number of Full-Time Equivalent Distributive Education Staff

N = 488

N	%	
66	13.6	Less Than 1.0
310	63.7	1.0-1.5
68	14.0	1.6-2.0
7	1.4	2.1-2.5
28	5.7	2.6-3.0
8	1.6	More Than 3.0

Number of Cooperative Distributive Education Class Sections

N	%	
291	59.1	1
135	27.4	2
32	6.5	3
26	5.3	Other

Number of Students Enrolled in Distributive Education Subjects by Grade Level

N = 492

Grade 10		Grade 11		Grade 12		
N	%	N	%	N	%	Number
210	42.7	60	12.2	4	.8	None
37	7.5	145	29.5	286	58.1	10- 25
14	2.8	117	23.8	135	27.4	26- 50
6	1.2	61	12.4	40	8.1	51-100
4	1.5	13	2.6	13	2.6	Over 100
221	44.9	96	19.5	14	2.8	No Response

APPENDIX D

COMBINED FORM I AND II TEACHER-COORDINATOR

Sample Survey Instrument

PART A

These questions have been prepared to determine practices which you follow in the *NORMAL* operation of your cooperative distributive education program.

Section 1

PLEASE CHECK THE BLANKS PROVIDED TO INDICATE THE APPROPRIATE DEGREE OF STUDENT UNDERSTANDING AND PREPARATION FOR *EACH* OF THE FOLLOWING:

1. The typical student who *enters* the cooperative phase of the distributive education program has an understanding of and preparation in each of the following areas:

	Extensive	Acquaintanceship	None	Don't Know
a. Working with people				
b. Written communications				
c. Oral communications				
d. Knowledge of products or services				
e. Salesmanship				
f. Advertising				
g. Display				
h. Public relations				
i. Buying				
j. Non-selling duties				
k. Decision making				
l. Distribution in the free enterprise system				
m. Job opportunities in marketing and distribution				
n. Understanding of how goods and services get from producer to consumer				
o. Mathematics of business				
p. Following directions				
q. Acceptance and adherence to company policies and procedures				
r. Other: please specify				

2. The typical student who graduates from the distributive education program has an understanding of and preparation in each of the following areas:

	Extensive	Acquaintanceship	None	Don't Know
a. Working with people				
b. Written communications				
c. Oral communications				
d. Knowledge of products and services				
e. Salesmanship				
f. Advertising				
g. Display				
h. Public relations				
i. Buying				
j. Non-selling duties				
k. Decision making				
l. Distribution in the free enterprise system				
m. Job opportunities in marketing and distribution				
n. Understanding of how goods and services get from producer to consumer				
o. Mathematics of business				
p. Following directions				
q. Acceptance and adherence to company policies and procedures				
r. Other: please specify				

Section II

PLEASE CHECK THE BLANKS PROVIDED TO INDICATE THE APPROPRIATE DEGREE OF FREQUENCY FOR *EACH* OF THE FOLLOWING:

3. Students whom I am presently able to recruit into the distributive education program have the following characteristics:

	Always	Usually	Sometimes	Seldom	Never
a. Neat appearance					
b. Physical maturity					
c. Mental maturity					
d. Pleasant personality					
e. Punctuality					
f. Dependability					
g. Industriousness					
h. Positive attitude					
i. Initiative					
j. Tact					
k. Desire to learn					
l. Honesty					
m. Self-confidence					
n. Cooperation					
o. Other: Please specify					

4. The personal characteristics possessed by students upon completion of the program are as follows:

	Always	Usually	Sometimes	Seldom	Never
a. Neat appearance					
b. Physical maturity					
c. Mental maturity					
d. Pleasant personality					
e. Punctuality					
f. Dependability					
g. Industriousness					
h. Positive attitude					
i. Initiative					
j. Tact					
k. Desire to learn					
l. Honesty					
m. Self-confidence					
n. Cooperation					
o. Other: Please specify					

5. Employers participate in the distributive education program for the following reasons:

	Always	Usually	Sometimes	Seldom	Never
a. To secure part-time workers					
b. To train students for future positions with their firm					
c. To train students for future positions in their type of businesses					
d. To be involved in an educational program to prepare youth for future positions in the field of distribution					
e. Because of directive from company headquarters to hire distributive education students					
f. Other: Please specify					

6. Types of contacts used to secure participation of employees in the distributive education program:

	Always	Usually	Sometimes	Seldom	Never
a. Personal visit to potential employer					
b. Telephone contact to potential employer					
c. Telephone request from interested employer					
d. Employer request following a civic or service club meeting attended by school personnel					
e. Referral from: advisory committee member					
f. Referral from: cooperating employer					
g. Referral from: Chamber of Commerce					
h. Referral from: merchant or trade organization					
i. Referral from: school placement service					
j. Referral from: state employment service					
k. Other: Please specify					

11. The number of days per week distributive education students work:

	Always	Usually	Sometimes	Seldom	Never
a. 1-2 days					
b. 3-4 days					
c. 5 days					
d. 6 days					
e. 7 days					

12. Employers and business personnel in which size firm provide the most effective on-the-job training for students employed in the distributive education program: (Please check only *one*)

_____a. 2- 10 employees
_____b. 10- 25 employees
_____c. 26- 75 employees
_____d. 76-150 employees
_____e. Over 150 employees

13. Students are placed in training stations using the following procedures:

	Always	Usually	Sometimes	Seldom	Never
a. Students seek out their own employment without being referred by me					
b. Send several students; employer selects student to be hired					
c. Several students qualified; employer makes final decision on hiring					
d. Refer *a student* who meets the requirements of employment with a firm with final acceptance a decision of the employer.					
e. Other: please specify					

7. Employers determine what hours distributive education students will work on the following basis:

	Always	Usually	Sometimes	Seldom	Never
a. Peak hour need					
b. Those hours for which it is difficult to hire part-time workers					
c. A regular weekly schedule					
d. Personnel needs on a day-to-day basis					
e. Availability of student					
f. After consultation with the coordinator					
g. Other: Please specify					

8. Students are employed from the program under school supervision for the following months of the year:

	Always	Usually	Sometimes	Seldom	Never
a. June through June (summer plus school year)					
b. September through June (school year only)					
c. September through December (first semester only)					
d. January through June (second semester only)					
e. June through December, and March through June					
f. September through December, and March through June					
g. Other: Please specify					

9. Employers schedule your distributive education students to work:

	Always	Usually	Sometimes	Seldom	Never
a. 15 hours or less					
b. 16-25 hours					
c. 26-35 hours					
d. More than 35 hours					

10. The time of day that distributive education students are available to work:

	Always	Usually	Sometimes	Seldom	Never
a. Morning hours					
b. Afternoon hours					
c. Evening hours					
d. Split shift					
e. Other: Please specify					

14. Distributive education students are paid on the following basis:

	Always	Usually	Sometimes	Seldom	Never
a. Same wage as paid to any student					
b. Higher wage than paid to students not in the training program					
c. Lesser wage than paid to students not in the training program					
d. By production and performance of student					
e. Same wage as paid any other employee for the same job assignment					
f. Union scale					
g. Other: Please specify					

15. How often do you visit training station:

	Always	Usually	Sometimes	Seldom	Never
a. Every two weeks or less					
b. Every three weeks					
c. Once each month					
d. Once each semester					
e. Once each grading period					
f. Only when there is some problem to be solved					
g. Other: Please specify					

Section III

THE FOLLOWING ITEMS HAVE BEEN DESIGNED TO DETERMINE THE IMPORTANCE OF SELECTED PHASES OF THE DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION PROGRAM STRUCTURE. INDICATE YOUR OPINION BY CHECKING THE APPROPRIATE SPACES ON THE RIGHT:

16. As you review this past year, *APPROXIMATELY* what proportion of your total *coordination time* is devoted to the following activities:

	None	Minor (Less Than 10%)	Considerable (10-35%)	Major (Over 35%)	Don't Know
a. Explaining the training program and the role of the employer and/or training sponsor					
b. Working with training sponsor and/or employer in implementing an on-the-job training plan					
c. Discussing with employer and/or training sponsor work performed by the student in the distributive education class which is related to the student's present and future employment					
d. Working with training sponsor and/or employer to solve the student's on-the-job problems					
e. Working with training supervisor (sponsor) or other personnel of firm to solve student's personal problems					
f. Establishing and maintaining good working relationships with personnel of the firm					
g. Working on in-school activities (i.e. preparing reports, guidance activities, etc.)					
h. Working on public relations activities in the community					

17. The importance of each of the following activities to the operation of your distributive education program:

	Very Important	Desirable	Unimportant
a. Assignment of a specific individual to serve as an on-the-job training sponsor for each distributive education student			
b. Training sessions to prepare training sponsors for their role in the training of distributive education students			
c. Business representatives participate in the classroom instruction phase of the program (i.e. speaker, resource person, etc.)			
d. Business representative participates in DECA Youth Group activities: (i.e. serving as judges for competitive events, for field trips, employer-employee banquets etc.)			
e. Advisory committee (made up of members representative of the employing community) to advise school officials on program operation			
f. Classroom instruction related to the learning experience of a student in his training station			
g. Materials for the student to study in school which are related to his on-the-job training experiences			
h. A written agreement establishing the responsibilities of student, school, and employer			
i. A plan of training for each student developed by coordinator and training sponsor			

18. Are there any *major problems* with which employers confront you that make it difficult to develop an effective Distributive Education Program?

_____ Yes _____ No

If the answer to the above question is *YES*, please indicate the *major* problem(s) by checking the appropriate response(s). NOTE: *If more than one response is checked, please number responses in order of importance. Consider No. 1 the most important problem.*

_____ a. Employer desires students having higher ability and interest level than those enrolling in the program
_____ b. Not employing students throughout school year because of budgetary restrictions
_____ c. Not providing a wage payment plan to encourage students
_____ d. Inadequate on-the-job training provided
_____ e. Union or Federal Wage and Hour Law restrictions
_____ f. Time of day when students are needed for employment
_____ g. Dress and grooming requirements
_____ h. Management's communication of the objectives of the program to the personnel actually working with the students
_____ i. Training sponsors not willing to spend needed amount of time with coordinator
_____ j. Other: Please specify _____

19. Are there any policies, practices, philosophies, or attitudes in your school which make it difficult to develop an effective Distributive Education Program?

_____ Yes _____ No

If the answer to the above question is *YES*, please indicate the resulting major problems by checking the appropriate response(s). NOTE: *If more than one response is checked, please number responses in order of importance. Consider No. 1 the most important problem.*

_____ a. Problems related to the recruitment of qualified students into program
_____ b. Unable to secure necessary materials, supplies, and equipment
_____ c. Inadequate time for coordination activities
_____ d. Ineffective or non-existent plan for vocational counseling
_____ e. Indifferent attitude of faculty and administration toward program
_____ f. Discouraged from or unable to devote time and effort to youth group activities
_____ g. Assigned to activities not related to distributive education during coordination time
_____ h. Other: Please specify _____

PART B

PERSONAL INFORMATION SHEET FOR TEACHER-COORDINATOR

DIRECTIONS: Please answer each of the following questions as they pertain to the operation of your cooperative program during the 1969–1970 school year. This information will be considered as *CONFIDENTIAL* and used for primarily cross classification purposes.

1. Approximate school enrollment in grades 10-12:

_____ a. Less than 500
_____ b. 500-1,000
_____ c. 1,001-2,000
_____ d. 2,001-3,000
_____ e. Over 3,000

2. Location of school:

_____ a. Inner city
_____ b. City
_____ c. Suburban
_____ d. Rural

3. Type of school:

_____ a. Area Vocational
_____ b. Comprehensive
_____ c. Trade-Technical
_____ d. Other: Please specify _____

4. Number of years cooperative distributive education program has been in operation:

_____ a. Less than 3 years
_____ b. 3-5 years
_____ c. 6-10 years
_____ d. 11-15 years
_____ e. Over 15 years

5. How many *full-time equivalent staff members* are teaching distributive education subjects in your school?

_____ a. Less than 1
_____ b. 1-1.5
_____ c. 1.6-2
_____ d. 2.1-2.5
_____ e. 2.6-3
_____ f. More than 3

6. How many cooperative distributive education class sections in your school? (Please consider either a single or double period class as one section)

_____a. One
_____b. Two
_____c. Three
_____d. Other: Please specify_____

7. How many students are enrolled in distributive education subjects for each grade level in your school?

	10th Grade	11th Grade	12th Grade
a. None			
b. 10-25			
c. 26-50			
d. 51-100			
e. Over 100			

8. Total number of years' experience as a distributive education coordinator:

_____a. One
_____b. Two
_____c. Three to five
_____d. Six to ten
_____e. More than ten

9. Do you work with a Distributive Education Advisory Committee which is recognized by your school?

_____a. Yes
_____b. No

10. Do you work with employees and/or training sponsor to develop and implement training plans?

_____a. Yes
_____b. No

PLEASE RETURN THIS COMPLETED FORM IN THE ENCLOSED POSTAGE PAID ENVELOPE TO:

Dr. E. Edward Harris
Professor of Distributive Education
College of Business
Northern Illinois University
De Kalb, Illinois 60115

APPENDIX E

COMBINED FORM I AND II EMPLOYER

Sample Survey Instrument

PART A

Please check the classification(s) below which describe(s) your position:

Manager or Owner _____ Department Manager _____
Training Supervisor (Sponsor) _____ Other (Please specify) _____
Personnel Manager _____ _____

Section I

DIRECTIONS: Please check the level of achievement or attainment, (1) for students who are employed as a part of the distributive education program (2) for individuals who might be employed full-time with your firm and hope to advance.

1. Please indicate the degree of level of understanding and preparation students employed in the D.E. program and individuals employed full-time need in each of the following areas:	FOR D.E. STUDENTS				FOR FULL-TIME EMPLOYMENT			
	EXTENSIVE	ACQUAINTANCESHIP	NONE	DON'T KNOW	EXTENSIVE	ACQUAINTANCESHIP	NONE	DON'T KNOW
a. Working with people								
b. Written communications								
c. Oral communications								
d. Knowledge of products or services								
e. Salesmanship								
f. Advertising								
g. Display								
h. Public relations								
i. Buying								
j. Non-selling duties								
k. Decision making								
l. Distribution in the free enterprise system								
m. Job opportunities in marketing and distribution								
n. Understanding of how goods and services get from producer to consumer								
o. Mathematics of business								
p. Following directions								
q. Acceptance and adherence to company policies								
r. Other: Please specify								

2. Please indicate the extent to which the following personal characteristics are needed by students you employ as a part of the D.E. program and for graduates who are employed full-time and hope to advance.	FOR D.E. STUDENTS				FOR FULL-TIME EMPLOYMENT			
	EXTENSIVE	ACQUAINTANCESHIP	NONE	DON'T KNOW	EXTENSIVE	ACQUAINTANCESHIP	NONE	DON'T KNOW
a. Neat appearance								
b. Physical maturity								
c. Mental maturity								
d. Pleasant personality								
e. Punctuality								
f. Dependability								
g. Industriousness								
h. Positive attitude								
i. Initiative								
j. Tact								
k. Desire to learn								
l. Honesty								
m. Self-confidence								
n. Cooperation								
o. Other: Please specify								

3. How important are career ambitions for students employed in your firm as a part of the D.E. program and for those employed full-time who hope to advance?	FOR D.E. STUDENTS				FOR FULL-TIME EMPLOYMENT			
	EXTENSIVE	ACQUAINTANCESHIP	NONE	DON'T KNOW	EXTENSIVE	ACQUAINTANCESHIP	NONE	DON'T KNOW
a. Interest in a future position in the field of distribution								
b. Interest in a future position in your type of business								
c. Interest in a future position in your firm								
d. Interest in working under a school								

Section II

DIRECTIONS: Please select only the three most applicable responses and rank in order of importance by writing 1, 2, and 3 in the selected blanks. (Consider 1 the most important.)

4. The reasons your firm participates in the distributive education program are:

_____a. To secure part-time workers
_____b. To train students for future positions with your firm
_____c. To train students for future positions in your type of business
_____d. To be involved in an educational program to prepare youth for future positions in the field of distribution
_____e. Because of directive from company headquarters to hire distributive education students
_____f. Other: Please specify

5. The contacts effective in influencing your firm to participate in the distributive education program are:

_____a. Personal visit by school teacher-coordinator
_____b. Telephone contact from school teacher-coordinator
_____c. Your telephone request to the school
_____d. Your request following a civic service club program attended by school personnel

_____e. An advisory committee member
_____f. An employer presently cooperating in the program
_____g. The Chamber of Commerce
_____h. A merchant or trade organization
_____i. State employment service
_____j. A school placement counselor
_____k. Other: Please specify _____

6. The procedures for accepting distributive education students for employment with your firm are:

_____a. Students seeking own job opportunity (nor referred by teacher-coordinator)
_____b. Teacher-coordinator sends several students; final selection being left to you
_____c. Teacher-coordinator selects several *qualified* students; final selection left to you
_____d. Teacher-coordinator refers *a student* who meets the requirements of employment in your firm with final acceptance being your decision
_____e. Other: Please specify _____

7. The methods for determining the hours a distributive education student is to be employed in your firm are:

_____a. Peak hour needs
_____b. Hours for which it is difficult to hire part-time employees
_____c. Regular weekly schedule
_____d. Personnel needs on a day-to-day basis
_____e. Availability of student
_____f. Consultation with teacher-coordinator
_____g. Other: Please specify _____

Section III

DIRECTIONS: Please check *only one response.*

8. The months of the year your firm *prefers* to employ distributive education students:

_____a. June through June (summer plus school year)
_____b. September through June (school year only)
_____c. September through December
_____e. June through December and March through June
_____f. September through December and March through June
_____g. Other: Please specify _____

9. The number of hours per week your firm *prefers* to schedule distributive education students:

_____a. 15 hours or less
_____b. 16-25 hours
_____c. 26-35 hours
_____d. Over 35 hours

10. The time of day your firm *prefers* to schedule distributive education students:

_____a. Morning hours
_____b. Afternoon hours
c. Evening hours
_____d. Split shift
_____e. Other: Please specify _____

11. Please indicate the number of days per week your firm *prefers* to schedule distributive education students to work:

_____a. 1-2 days
_____b. 3-4 days
_____c. 5 days
_____d. 6 days
_____e. 7 days

12. The wage payment plan your firm *prefers* to use in paying distributive education students:

_____a. Same wage as paid to any other student
_____b. Higher wage than paid to students not in the training program
_____c. Lesser wage than paid to students not in the training program
_____d. Production and performance of student
_____e. Same wage as paid any other employee for the same job assignment
_____f. Union scale
_____g. Other: Please specify _____

13. The teacher-coordinator should visit your firm:

_____a. Every 2 weeks or less
_____b. Every 3 weeks
_____c. Once each month
_____d. Once each semester
_____e. Once each grading period
_____f. Only when there is some problem to be solved
_____g. Other: Please specify _____

Section IV

DIRECTIONS: Please indicate your opinion by checking the appropriate spaces at the right for each item.

14. How important are each of the following to the operation of the Distributive Education Program?	VERY IMPORTANT	DESIRABLE	UNIMPORTANT	DON'T KNOW
a. Assignment of a specific individual in your firm to serve as an on-the-job training supervisor (sponsor) for each distributive education student				
b. Training sessions to prepare supervisors (sponsors) for their role in working with distributive education students.				
c. Business representatives participate in the classroom instruction phase of the program, i.e. speaker, resource person.				
d. Business representatives participate in DECA Youth Group activities, i.e. serving as judges for competitive events, for field trips, employee-employer banquets.				
e. Advisory committee (made up of members representative of the employing community) to advise school officials on program operation.				
f. Classroom instruction related to the learning experiences of the student in his on-the-job training experiences.				
g. Materials for the student to study in school which are related to his on-the-job training experiences.				
h. A written agreement establishing the responsibilities of student, school, and employer.				
i. A plan of training for each student developed by coordinator and training supervisor (sponsor).				

15. How important are the following teacher-coordinator activities in the operation of the Distributive Education program in your firm?	VERY IMPORTANT	DESIRABLE	UNIMPORTANT	DON'T KNOW
a. Establishing and maintaining good working relationships with personnel of your firm.				
b. Explaining the training program and the role of the employer and/or on-the-job training supervisor (sponsor).				
c. Working with training supervisor (sponsor) in developing and implementing on-the-job training plan.				
d. Discussing work performed by the student in the Distributive Education class which is related to the student's present and future employment.				
e. Working with training supervisor (sponsor) and/or employer to solve student's on-the-job problems.				
f. Working with training supervisor (sponsor) or other personnel of the firm to solve student's personal problems.				

16. Are there any major problems with which the "school" confronts you that make it difficult to develop an effective program for the training of distributive education students?

_____ Yes _____ No

If the answer to the above question is *YES*, please indicate the *major* problems by checking the appropriate responses. NOTE: *If more than one response is checked, please number responses in order of importance. Consider No. 1 the most important problem.*

_____ a. Students not available when needed
_____ b. Students not properly selected by teacher-coordinator for employment in our firm
_____ c. Students view the program as an easy way to get out of school
_____ d. Students view the program primarily as a way to earn money and are not serious about being a producing worker
_____ e. Students have too many extra-curricular activities
_____ f. School requirements for hours of minimum hours of employment per week
_____ g. Coordinator pressures you to offer more training positions for Distributive Education students
_____ h. Classroom experiences not effectively related to on-the-job training
_____ i. Number of qualified students available for employment is inadequate
_____ j. Coordinator visits are too time consuming
_____ k. Coordinator visits are not carefully planned
_____ l. Other: Please specify _____

17. Are there any policies and/or management decisions of your firm that make it difficult to develop an effective program of training for distributive education students?

_____ Yes _____ No

If the answer to the above question is *YES*, please indicate by checking the appropriate responses. NOTE: *If more than one response is checked, please number responses in order of importance. Consider No. 1 the most important problem.*

_____ a. Inflexibility
_____ b. Budgetary controls
_____ c. Age requirements for employees
_____ d. Union requirements
_____ e. Other: Please specify _____

PART B

BUSINESS CLASSIFICATION

DIRECTIONS: Please check the category in each case that best describes your firm.

1. Type of business:

_____ Retail _____ Wholesale _____ Service

2. Nature of business:

_____ a. Advertising Services
_____ b. Apparel and Accessories
_____ c. Automotive
_____ d. Finance and Credit
_____ e. Floristry
_____ f. Food Distribution
_____ g. Food Service
_____ h. General Merchandise (i.e., department stores, variety stores, general merchandise stores, discount stores, and catalog houses)
_____ i. Hardware, Building Materials, Farm and Garden Supplies and Equipment
_____ j. Home Furnishings
_____ k. Hotel and Lodging
_____ l. Industrial Marketing
_____ m. Insurance
_____ n. International Trade
_____ o. Personnel Services
_____ p. Petroleum
_____ q. Real Estate
_____ r. Recreation and Tourism
_____ s. Transportation

_____t. Wholesale Trade; other (please specify)_____

_____u. Retail Trade; other (please specify) _____

_____v. Other: Please specify _____

3. Organization of business:

_____a. Single Proprietorship
_____b. Partnership
_____c. Corporation
_____d. Franchise
_____e. Cooperative
_____f. Other: (specify)_____
_____

4. Location of business: (one location only–not total company)

_____a. Downtown shopping area
_____b. Neighborhood shopping area
_____c. Shopping center
_____d. Other: (specify) _____
_____

5. Size of Community:

_____a. Less than 10,000
_____b. 10,001-50,000
_____c. 50,001-100,000
_____d. 100,001-250,000
_____e. 250,001-500,000
_____f. Over 500,000

6. Number of employees in your firm (one location only–not total company)

_____a. 2-10 employees
_____b. 11-25 employees
_____c. 26-75 employees
_____d. 76-150 employees
_____e. Over 150 employees

7. How many of your employees are graduates of a distributive education program?

_____a. None
_____b. 1-2 employees
_____c. 3-5 employees
_____d. 6-10 employees
_____e. Over 10 employees
_____f. Don't Know

8. How many distributive education students has your firm (one location only–not total company) trained over the past two years?

_____a. Less than 4 students
_____b. 4-6 students
_____c. 7-15 students
_____d. 16-25 students
_____e. Over 25 students
_____f. Don't know

9. Do the distributive education programs you are currently working with have advisory committees?

_____a. Yes
_____b. No
_____c. Majority
_____d. Don't know
_____e. Other: (Please specify)_____

10. Do the distributive education teacher-coordinators you are currently working with develop on-the-job plans for trainingin cooperation with members of your firm?

_____a. Yes
_____b. No
_____c. Majority
_____d. Don't know
_____e. Other: (Please specify) _____ _____

THANK YOU!

PLEASE RETURN THIS COMPLETED FORM IN THE POSTAGE PAID ENVELOPE TO:

Dr. E. Edward Harris
Professor of Distributive Education
College of Business
Northern Illinois University
De Kalb, Illinois 60115

APPENDIX F

Teacher-Coordinator Letter of Transmittal

NORTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY

DEKALB, ILLINOIS 60115

Department of
BUSINESS EDUCATION

Area Code 815
Telephone 753-1177

FROM: Dr. E. Edward Harris, Region V Project Director

TO: Distributive Education Teacher Coordinators

SUBJECT: Region V, U. S. Office of Education, Distributive Education Survey

Thank you for your help! By sending us a list of those firms which serve as training stations for your distributive education students, you have made it possible for us to conduct a study of the practices of coordinators and preferences of business personnel who are working directly with distributive education. From the over 8,500 cooperating employers that were referred to us, we have randomly selected 1,000 who will be asked to indicate their preferences in working with distributive education. Will you please invest 15 minutes of your time to indicate your normal practices in the operation of your distributive education program?

Your reply will be studied carefully together with those of other teacher-coordinators and cooperating employers in Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, and Wisconsin. Your individual responses will be kept confidential. The results of the survey will serve as a basis for developing a dialogue between Distributive and Business personnel during the 1971 U. S. Office of Education Regional Distributive Education Meeting in Benton Harbor, Michigan.

I wish to express my appreciation to you in advance for the time and effort that you will devote to completing the enclosed questionnaire. If you have any questions concerning the survey instrument, please feel free to contact me. We hope to have your completed form by May 18, 1970.

pb

Enclosure

APPENDIX G

Employer Letter of Transmittal

NORTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY

DEKALB, ILLINOIS 60115

Department of
BUSINESS EDUCATION

Area Code 815
Telephone 753-1177

FROM: Dr. E. Edward Harris, Region V Research Project Director

TO: Selected Business Leaders

SUBJECT: Region V, U. S. Office of Education, Distributive Education Survey

The name of your firm has been submitted by your local high school distributive education teacher-coordinator indicating that you are actively working with distributive education students. On behalf of the Distributive Education Program Committee Region V, U. S. Office of Education, I wish to express my sincere appreciation for what you are doing to help the youth of America to become productive citizens.

The Distributive Education Program Planning Committee, which is made up of Business leaders and educators has, during the past five years, been vitally concerned with trying to improve working relationships between business and education. We, too, feel a commitment to help the youth of America. We have been devoting our time and services in an effort to study the practices and preferences of individuals working with distributive education programs. Because of the experience and expertise you have gained as a cooperating employer, your assistance is most vitally needed in examining cooperative distributive education programs.

Will you please invest 15 minutes of your time to complete the enclosed questionnaire? Your reply will be studied carefully together with those of other business personnel in the states of Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, and Wisconsin. The results will be used to upgrade distributive education programs to better meet the needs of the business community and to strengthen the educational programs for students. You may wish to consult with other members of your staff who have been involved in the distributive education program. We are anxious to have the thinking of as many people as possible.

I wish to express my appreciation to you in advance for the time and effort that you will devote to completing the enclosed survey. If you have any questions concerning the survey instrument, please feel free to contact me.

kc

Enclosure

APPENDIX H

Follow-up Letter

NORTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY

DEKALB, ILLINOIS 60115

Department of
BUSINESS EDUCATION

Area Code 815
Telephone 753-1177

TO: REGION V, DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION SURVEY PARTICIPANTS

FROM: DR. E. EDWARD HARRIS, REGION V PROJECT DIRECTOR

SUBJECT: REGION V DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION SURVEY

Approximately two weeks ago a distributive education survey form was mailed to your office. The Region V., U.S. Office of Education Program Planning Committee is anxious to have a 100 percent response.

Will you please indicate the action that has been taken on the lower portion of this memorandum and please return it to me as soon as possible in the enclosed business reply envelope.

. . . . . .

PLEASE RETURN TO: Dr. E. Edward Harris
College of Business
Northern Illinois University
DeKalb, Illinois 60115

THE DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION SURVEY FORM:

Was not received or has been misplaced_____

Was completed and mailed_____

Will be completed by _____ and returned
date

We will NOT be able to participate in the survey_____

Comments:_____

_____

_____

Name_____

Name of Firm or School_____

Address_____

_____Zip Code_____

Gregg/McGraw-Hill
Hightstown, NJ 08520
Manchester Road, Manchester, MO 63011
8171 Redwood Highway, Novato, CA 94947
Elm at Houston, Dallas, TX 75202
(Texas schools only)

L-85276